

University of Rhode Island

**DigitalCommons@URI**

---

Open Access Dissertations

---

2015

## AN EXAMINATION OF ARGUMENTATION IN UNDERGRADUATE COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS

Wendy Lee Grosskopf

University of Rhode Island, [wendy\\_grosskopf@my.uri.edu](mailto:wendy_grosskopf@my.uri.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa\\_diss](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss)

---

### Recommended Citation

Grosskopf, Wendy Lee, "AN EXAMINATION OF ARGUMENTATION IN UNDERGRADUATE COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS" (2015). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 331.  
[https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa\\_diss/331](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/331)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu).

AN EXAMINATION OF ARGUMENTATION IN  
UNDERGRADUATE COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS

BY

WENDY LEE GROSSKOPF

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF  
PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLISH

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2015

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION**

**OF**

**Wendy Lee Grosskopf**

**APPROVED:**

**Dissertation Committee:**

**Major Professor Robert Schwegler**

**Michael Pennell**

**Kevin McClure**

**Nasser Zawia**

**DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL**

**UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND**

**2015**

## **ABSTRACT**

This dissertation describes an investigation of the practice of teaching argumentation in the undergraduate composition classroom in large part by examining a corpus consisting of 16 commonly used argumentation textbooks with publication dates from 2010 to 2014. The purpose of this project is to help advance the teaching of written argumentation by examining how it is defined, justified, and taught via textbooks, by ranking the textbooks on a 1-3 sliding scale according to how well the lesson plans within them are equipped to teach students how to write arguments according to what the authors and publishers describe as the ideal argument.

This study is conducted in two phases: The first is a process in which the textbooks are categorized into one of three types, or uses, of argumentation (academic/professional, advocacy, or exploration). The second phase is the evaluation of two chapters in each book to see how well the activities in them are developed as to help student learn to write the classified argument. The final chapter of this dissertation contains recommendations that can be adapted by future textbooks authors, editors, and publishers, recommendations that involve developing books that more clearly identify with one or more of the three categories making up this taxonomy, as well as adding sections that teach students to use a stasis-mapping formula to evaluate existing, as well as to create new, arguments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Michael C. Pennell, formerly Associate Professor at the Department of Writing and Rhetoric at the University of Rhode Island and currently associate professor at the College of Communication and Information at The University of Kentucky. Dr. Pennell not only served as my chief advisor on this dissertation project, but has been a constant supporter since my arrival at The University of Rhode Island in August, 2009. I also hold deep gratitude for the other members of my dissertation committee, who provided warmth, encouragement, and feedback that was much appreciated and necessary to get me through the process of completing this work. These faculty members at The University of Rhode Island are Dr. Robert Schwegler, Professor in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric, Dr. Kevin McClure, Professor and Department Chair in the Communications Department, Dr. Diane Kern, Associate Professor in the Education Department, and Dr. Renee Hobbs, Founding Director of the Harrington School of Communication and Media and Professor in the Communications Department. I owe deep gratitude as well for the administrative work of Donna Hayden and Michelle Caraccia, who worked to assure I was provided with all of the knowledge and paperwork necessary to move this dissertating process along.

I have tremendous respect and appreciation for my husband, Dr. Wolf Grosskopf. The project of obtaining this PhD would not have even gotten off the ground without his unwavering support of and belief in me. And for their much-appreciated moral support, I'd like to thank my dear friends Stephanie Gendron-Wall, Teka-Lark Fleming, Dr. Patrick Logan, Agnieszka Grace Rosner, Gary Allan Fellows, and last – but far from least – Patrick Anthony James Mooney.

## **DEDICATION**

This dissertation is dedicated to my father

John Francis Grosskopf

(February 12, 1941 – August 24, 2012)

who encouraged me to believe

in my dreams

and taught me that hard work can

turn them into realities.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables .....	viii
<b>CHAPTER ONE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction to the Arguments for Stasis, and the Stases of Argumentation	
<b>CHAPTER TWO .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Taxonomy of Contemporary Argumentation Models, Systems of Logic Behind Them, and What We Can Do to Make Practical Sense of Them	
<b>CHAPTER THREE.....</b>	<b>39</b>
The Design, Results, and an Analytical Discussion of This Study	
<b>CHAPTER FOUR .....</b>	<b>57</b>
Tracing Stasis in Argument from Triggering Issue to Desired Telos by Solving for Formula $[(TI) * (CSL) * (DT) = (LOSQ)]$	
<b>APPENDIX ONE.....</b>	<b>76</b>
Existing Argumentation Theories as Categorized According to Three- Use Taxonomy	
<b>APPENDIX TWO.....</b>	<b>80</b>
Phase One: Classifying Academic/Professional Textbooks According to Three-Use Taxonomy	
<b>APPENDIX THREE.....</b>	<b>82</b>
Phase One: Classifying Advocacy Textbooks According to Three-Use Taxonomy	

<b>APPENDIX FOUR .....</b>	<b>84</b>
Phase One: Classifying Explorative Textbooks According to Three-Use Taxonomy	
<b>APPENDIX FIVE .....</b>	<b>85</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>The Aims of Argument</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> edition) by Timothy W. Crusius and Carolyn E. Channell	
<b>APPENDIX SIX .....</b>	<b>87</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>A Little Argument</i> (2 <sup>ND</sup> edition) by Faigley and Selzer	
<b>APPENDIX SEVEN .....</b>	<b>88</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>A Practical Study of Argument</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> ed) by Trudy Govier	
<b>APPENDIX EIGHT.....</b>	<b>93</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>Argument</i> (2nd ed) by John Gooch and Dorothy Seyler	
<b>APPENDIX NINE.....</b>	<b>95</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>Argumentation: Understanding and Shaping Arguments</i> by James A. Herrick	
<b>APPENDIX TEN .....</b>	<b>99</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>College Argument: Understanding the Genre</i> by Irene L. Clark	
<b>APPENDIX ELEVEN .....</b>	<b>101</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>Critical Thinking, Reading and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument</i> by Sylvan Barnet and Hugo Bedau	
<b>APPENDIX TWELVE .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>Dialogues: An Argument</i>	



<i>Reader and Text</i> by Gary Goshgarian and Kathleen Krueger	
<b>APPENDIX THIRTEEN</b> .....	<b>108</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>Elements of Argument</i> :	
<i>A Text and Reader</i> by Annette T. Rottenberg and Donna Haisty Winchell	
<b>APPENDIX FOURTEEN</b> .....	<b>111</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>Everything's an Argument</i>	
by Andrea A. Lunsford and John J. Ruszkiewicz	
<b>APPENDIX FIFTEEN</b> .....	<b>113</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on <i>From Critical Thinking to</i>	
<i>Argument</i> by Sylvan Barnet and Hugo Bedau	
<b>APPENDIX SIXTEEN</b> .....	<b>115</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for <i>Inventing Arguments</i>	
(3 <sup>rd</sup> ed) by John Mauk and John Metz	
<b>APPENDIX SEVENTEEN</b> .....	<b>119</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for <i>The Purposeful Argument</i> :	
<i>A Practical Guide</i> by Harry Phillips and Patricia Bostian	
<b>APPENDIX EIGHTEEN</b> .....	<b>127</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for <i>Read, Reason, Write: An</i>	
<i>Argument Text and Reader</i> by Dorothy U. Seyler	
<b>APPENDIX NINETEEN</b> .....	<b>131</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for <i>They Say/I Say</i> by Gerald	
Graff, Cathy Birkenstein, and Russel Durst	
<b>APPENDIX TWENTY</b> .....	<b>133</b>
Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for <i>The Well-Crafted Argument</i>	
by Fred D. White and Simone J. Billings	
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>135</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Qualities and Stasis Questions of Three-Use Argumentation Taxonomy .....	19
Table 2: Itemization of the Textbook Corpus .....	42
Table 3: Three Uses Summarized and Defined .....	46
Table 4: Coding Scheme for Phase One .....	48
Table 5: Rubric for Academic/Professional Category .....	49
Table 6: Rubric for Advocacy Category .....	50
Table 7: Rubric for Explorative Category .....	51
Table 8: Scores for the Academic/Professional Textbooks .....	52
Table 9: Scores for the Advocacy Textbooks .....	53
Table 10: Scores for the Explorative Category .....	53
Table 11: The Blends .....	55
Table 12: A Factual Argument as Mapped through the Stasis Formula .....	72
Table 13: A Positional Argument as Mapped Via Stasis Formula .....	73

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION TO ARGUMENTS FOR STASIS, AND THE STASES OF ARGUMENTATION

“Argument is the most powerful social force, perhaps even the very cradle of thought”

- Jay Heinrichs, leading expert on persuasion

#### *Introduction*

Every ideology, all legal systems, and each person’s individual code of ethics that exist in our human world are built over and supported by frameworks of argumentation. Because of its power to shape our environment, it is no wonder why so many of us are obsessed, so determined to master the craft of constructing and delivering successful arguments. To write this description in classic Habermasian – all public social spheres are created and shaped by informed, well-argued citizens who are both willing and able to take on the important public role of entering, shaping, and creating discursive domains. These are often considered to be the most valuable members of society because they contribute to a healthy democracy.

Unsurprisingly, then, the ability to argue well is considered to be among the most important skills a student will learn in college. It is of high priority for composition instructors and theorists to find ways to teach students to argue effectively in writing, but this is easier said than done, as evidenced by the overwhelmingly large percentage of student papers that are “sterile” and “linked only by their singular lack of creative or critical thought” (Alford 115). Maxine Hairston is among several composition scholars who note with dismay a tendency for students to write dull-mechanical debates, arguments too obviously and clearly formulated, with whose sides are too sharply drawn. Because the ability to write effective arguments is such an important skill for students to master, and because issues in student

papers strongly suggest a flaw in our approaches to teaching the writing of arguments, the work contained by this dissertation project surrounds the task of understanding what, exactly, is behind the issue of pedagogical lacks that prevent us from effectively teaching the written argument.

Because any serious study should begin by working to understand the origins and definitions of the object of study, this first chapter is dedicated largely to laying out the history of argumentation studies and practices. Specifically, I investigate the stasis in argument – I do so for several reasons: As I explain in the next section of this chapter, argumentation terms have been historically and still are confusing, often over-defined, often under-defined, and often terms and the concepts attached to them are used interchangeably. This is the case with stasis, originally conceived in classic Roman times as a system for inventing argumentative proofs, but has been at times elevated so grandiosely as to be said that stasis *is* argument – it is the line of reasoning that begins at the triggering issue and stretches until eventual conclusion/resolution. This historical outlaying relays into the next chapter, in which I show how contemporary models of argument are still confusing, over- and under-defined, and the large number of models make for little wonder why our pedagogy is lacking. If we cannot adequately even first define a term, how do we expect to teach well the concept it describes? At the same time, arguments are used for a great number of reasons and in any amount of situations by all communicating peoples, so to settle on a single, all-encompassing definition might be too narrow, too rigid to contain this complex activity. Therefore, I end the second chapter by offering a compromise between the wild abstraction of the multitude of current argumentation schematics and the too-narrow single definition by offering a new, three-use-system argumentation taxonomy. This taxonomy, then, can be used to judge the standards by which we teach written argument. I set about doing exactly this by investigating a corpus of undergraduate argumentation textbooks to see how well their lessons are geared to teach students these three types of argument that make up my taxonomy. The third chapter of this

dissertation lays out the exigency, methods and methodology of my textbook study, the results of which are summarized and analyzed in the third chapter as well.<sup>1</sup> The fifth chapter of this dissertation returns to the idea of stasis as an invention formula. In this final chapter, I offer a formula that can be used to diagram existing, as well as invent new stasis lines of argument.

### *What is Stasis?*

This first chapter is an overview of stasis in argumentation – what is it, where it was conceived and utilized, why its theory and practice is a significant contribution to the development of arguments, when was it developed and when was/is it practiced, how, exactly, does it work, and who are the theorists and practitioners working with stasis. An historical timeline of the development of stasis theory and use serves as more than a “fun-facts” background section – not only does this chronology map out this concept from the “pre-stasis” days of Aristotle to theories and practices in use today, but, perhaps more importantly, also describes its relation to other parts of argument, specifically *topoi*, *sylogisms*, and *demonstrations*, as to provide a clear picture of how these various “parts” of argument interrelate. Further, as I explain in this chapter’s introduction, this historical timeline is meant to show the dizzying confusion among terms and concepts in the study and practice of argumentation, a confusion that exists still today; chapter 2 is largely an attempt to unravel this knotted mess.

I will return to the confusion among terms in argumentation studies and practices shortly and at several other points throughout this dissertation. But I will begin by offering a clear description of stasis, commonly defined as is “a taxonomy, a system of classifying the kinds of questions that can be at issue in a controversy” (Fahnestock and Secor 1983, 137). It is shaped as a categorically and sequentially driven questioning system used to interrogate specific kinds of issues or questions at stake in arguments. These separate categories classify

---

<sup>1</sup> Full results are provided in several appendixes to this dissertation.

rhetorical problems according to the underlying structure of the dispute that each involves, useful because such classification helps identify appropriate argumentative strategies. In action, the categories build off one another in that the questions appropriate under each work sequentially as this method involves a series of questions to ask about a topic in order to reach the heart of the matter. Centuries of evolution cumulated into today's commonly accepted system of four "types" or categories: conjectural, definitional, qualitative, and translatable, each category of which houses series of topic-appropriate questions.

By determining what questions are asked in an argument, it establishes the direction and eventual outcome of a debate. Each stasis category has its own subcategories of *topoi* to account for unique circumstances which warrant the asking of different lines of questions from one another. Under issues of fact, for instance, are *topoi* such as motive, ability, desire, and defendant's character. Under the category of definition, we would have already determined a fact, e.g. that an act, such as one's death by the hands of another, has occurred. At this stage, then, the task becomes determining how to define the death. Was it murder? Was it manslaughter? Is the typical definitional *topos* of setting forth the features of a crime, such as treason, and then showing how the defendant's actions either meet or do not meet those features.

Categorically defined questions are posed in sequence because each depends on the question(s) preceding it. Before we can ask questions specific to concerns of definition, quality, or translation, it is necessary to first establish a fact. Patterns of argument appropriate to a question of fact (did the defendant do what is alleged?) may be irrelevant in an evaluative dispute (was the defendant justified in doing that?), or in the definition of legal case: How are the facts categorized? If a eunuch lies beside another man's wife, is it really adultery? (Heath 117). In a courtroom proceeding concerning the first stasis category of fact, the council seeks to prove whether something is, or is not, true, so questions such as motive, ability, desire, and

character are appropriate. Once a fact has been determined, it is possible to advance to later categories.

An example is the topic of “gods.” In the first stasis category, questions asked would aim to determine a fact: whether or not gods exists. If it has been determined that God does not exist, then questions concerning whether a particular act was divine would be of no concern; if God does exist, questions regarding whether a specific act was divine would then be explored. In other words, only those who think a work is an act of a god must necessarily “also think that gods exist” Carroll 158). Different questions are needed when a fact is known but what is not known is how to classify the issue. If we have determined the fact that gods do not exist, asking whether a particular working was divine (translation) is illogical and unnecessary. However, if the determination is that gods do exist, it is appropriate to ask questions appropriate to a sequentially later category (Kennedy 117) in effort to move the conversation from stalemate to solution. Or, litigants in a case of murder may agree that the defendant killed a man (fact) and that it was murder (definition) but disagree as to whether or not the murder was justified, the defendant claiming that it was an act of temporary insanity as opposed to murder in the first degree (quality). Therefore, the question around which the entire case revolves is: Was the defendant justified in committing the murder? For instance, consider the Trayvon Martin trial.<sup>2</sup> In this case, the first level of stasis addresses fact: Is it true that Trayvon Martin is dead? Is it true that he was killed? Is it true that George Zimmerman killed him on a rainy February night in Florida? Once this point has been determined, we move to the second stasis, that of definition. Was this act manslaughter, or was it murder? The decision was based on consideration of the third stasis category, that of quality: Was

---

<sup>2</sup> This refers to the legal trial that ensued after the night of February 26, 2012, in Sanford, Florida, United States, when George Zimmerman, a 28-year-old mixed-race Hispanic man who was the neighborhood watch coordinator for the gated community, fatally shot Trayvon Martin, an unarmed 17-year-old African American high school student who was temporarily living in this community, and where the shooting took place. The trial revolved upon determining whether or not the fatality was the result of self-defense on Zimmerman’s part.

Zimmerman justified in killing Martin to save his own life? The fourth stasis category, jurisdiction, was the determination that this is a criminal, rather than a civil, case.

Paradoxically, that the word “stasis” might most readily evoke conceptions of “static” of stagnation, of stillness, this vital part of argument is anything but. Rather, as scholar and professor of rhetoric Michael Carter explains the “stasiatic conflict is generative, creating an impetus for rhetorical action.” It is not the state of stillness or stagnation, but the result of “the confrontation of two opposing movements or forces,” a confrontation that “bears a strong sense of the potential energy of creation and action.” Stasis begins when “two opposite, or contrary dynamics... have come into contact with one another and are now ‘together’” (99). It begins at the point of opposition, of a viewpoint, law, or other condition challenged or otherwise questioned. It then sequences through the entire process of an argument. The initial impasse, the doubtful or disputed issue under review, marks the starting point of a “line of stasis”.<sup>3</sup> This “line” traces the path of discovery via use of the questions and answers imposed as to resolve the issue its driving force that moves the argument from its triggering issue to the final resolution of assertion or denial.

Carter calls this theoretical notion of stasis as an entire system of movement consisting of the issue (e.g., the issue in itself, as well as the line of questioning leading to the resolution and the resolution in itself) as *peristaseis*. This definition encapsulates the “surrounding circumstances” of an issue, the “things which surround, envelop, or are involved in the opposite, or contrary movements are the things likewise which are involved in the intervening stasis” (101). In practical terms, this is the initial accusation and denial, such as in a court case, and more generally the claim in opposition to the counterclaim. It “represents the place where rhetoric begins, an explicit or implicit disagreement or conflict” (Carter 99). A line begins at the point in which the rhetor, whether by own choice or as driven by virtue of a

---

<sup>3</sup> “Line of stasis” is my term to describe the movement from start to finish in any argument.



conflict, needs to discover what exists in that space between “what he already knew and the knowledge of others” (Carter 159).

A line of stasis is a generative entity. It is the process of becoming which moves and argument past the standstill of the initial question and to the finish line. Stasis is inseparable from any argument that a party or parties involved wish to solve since this procedure resumes “movement toward ultimate decision” bypassing the former impasse, to a point “in that the efficient audience efficiently agrees with the assertion or denial, i.e., puts aside the contradictory and so resolves the opposition” (Carter 998). This is done via a method of “systematic interrogation”, a carefully planned questioning sequence, as the engine to drive the line of this argument from initial impasse to resolution; this method of questioning is “the action that is sparked to overcome that impasse” (Carter 97). The stasis question, or sequence of questions, “guides the rest of the rhetorical discourse toward the final judgment, thus making the discourse an act of inquiry (Carter 67). This process, then, is a means for solving questions in that it “not only encompasses the temporary impasse of opposing positions and the action that is sparked to overcome that impasse, but it also provides a *direction* for action—toward the resolution of the conflict” (Carter 100). It is said to be “the *quaestio* that provides the implicit goal for discourse because the answer to the question—the decision of judge or jury or legislature—is the resolution of the initial conflict” (Carter 351).

### *History of Stasis in (and/instead of) Argumentation*

Argumentation can be understood as a line of stasis, which I define as the direction an argument moves from start to finish, a line that is driven by the human rhetor as to reach the end, or *Telos*, of an argument. We can trace early recognition of the necessity for strategies to drive this line to Aristotle, whose strategies for reaching conclusion in debates served as a model for the later-developed stasis model. He also recognized the need for different systems for different aims, foreshadowing the topic-specific divisions of stasis categories. Application

of stasis technique is situational, used differently depending upon the *topoi* in question, and it is this flexibility based on specific event and time that makes it useful for providing ways of defining “the rhetorical situation, particularly the rhetorical question, so that the rhetorician can respond with arguments that are appropriate to that situation” (Carter 100). About *Telos*, Aristotle discussed them in terms of his three discourses of rhetoric -- the deliberative, the forensic, and the epideictic. The *Telos* for the conjectural, the legal, and the jurisdictional issues which the three discourses share all have different goals. Pointing out that “to the deliberator the end is what is advantageous or disadvantageous, the other issues are beside the point; to the litigant the *Telos* is what is just or unjust, and for the ceremonial orator what is noble or shameful” (Murphy et al 64), Aristotle conceived of speeches tailored for specific needs – speeches in favor for or against a future action, in favor of or against a past action, as well as speeches composed as a display of oratorical power (Gwynn 98, 99). These speeches were meant to address specific “types” of issues for reasons of efficiency and clarity. On the one hand, a certain amount of catering is necessary since any argument would easily unravel if there are “too many directions to follow” (Carroll 157). Relevant questions help determine the point of contention in an argument. On the other hand, to write speeches for every single individual case would be cumbersome and redundant. To strike a balance, Aristotle wrote his speeches according to his *commonplaces*, as he called topical questions that occur with regularity. He described *commonplaces* as “those regions in which the speaker would venture to invent and organize material” (Carroll 158). Various classifications of *topoi*, as Aristotle explains in his posthumously published lecture notes, are necessary delineations and different arguments must be developed to account for variations among the classes for many reasons, largely that “the kind of auditor and the time of the subject determine the kinds of discourses” (*Rhetoric* line 35). Different lines of reasons, different questions need to be asked, to conclude an argument under the *topos* of law as opposed to that of definition.

However, Aristotle's *topoi*, his system comprised of topic categories intended for rhetoricians to memorize and apply to any situation involving law courts, was criticized as unclear, confusion resulted from having too many directions that questions related to various *topoi* can go. Hermagoras, seeing the need for a systematic system with clearly defined topical categories, developed his theory of *stasis* to enhance and clarify Aristotle's unwieldy ideas about rhetoric. Stasis was later used widely by other rhetoricians, such as Cicero, whose "status theory" is said to be influenced by his "passion for classification that is characteristic of ancient rhetorical thought, [Cicero's] status theory offers [its users] an ever-expanding grid of the classification of notional circumstances paired with the appropriate rhetorical response" (Dugan 28).

But exactly what, and how many, categories should set the standard has been debated throughout the centuries. Today's neat, widely-accepted model of four sequentially ordered categories was hard won. Arguments arise from any number of different *topoi*. Stasis categories are grouped together according topics. The connection between topics and stasis was perhaps best understood by Quintilian, who pointed out that one must consider stasis questions "in connexion with those 'places' in which they most naturally arise" (Butler 237). Stasis categories are grouped accordingly as to lead the rhetor to *topoi* appropriate to that issue. Determining what questions to ask regarding a specific topic of argument establishes the direction and eventual outcome of a debate.

Hermagoras's original system consisted of four: *conjectura*, (conjecture) *proprietas*, (definition), *qualitias* (quality) and *translation* (translation). This design was challenged famously by several rhetoricians, such as Cornificius,<sup>4</sup> who shared his teacher's conviction that there are not four, but three, categories: (1) conjectural, a question of fact; (2) legitimate, based on interpretation of a text; and (3) juridical, when an act is admitted but its right or

---

<sup>4</sup> Cornificius, is called by some "Pseudo-Cicero" as his philosophies and teachings closely resembles Cicero to the extent that, until fairly recently, Cicero was credited with the writing of Cornificius's famous work *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*.

wrong is in question” (qtd. Murphy et al, 137). Quintilian, too, considered Hermagoras’s four-category system to be “somewhat faulty” in that he included *translation* as an independent system. Quintilian (McKeon 4), insisted there are but “clearly three points to which we must give attention, namely, Whether it is, What it is and Of what kind it is” (Butler 229). The elimination of this fourth category left Hermagoras with only three stasis categories (Holtsmark 357).

Cicero joined the attack against Hermagoras, insisting in *De Inventione* a book consisting of his early work on rhetoric, he echoed the three-question model in his insistence that “[e]very subject which contains in itself a controversy to be resolved by speech and debate involves a question about a fact, or about a definition, or about the nature of an act, or about the legal processes” (I, 8, 10). And, in *Topica*, Cicero describes his conception of stasis which distinguishes between “general questions, broad philosophical questions without specific persons involved, and ‘special cases,’ controversies put forward in speech that entail definite individuals” (Dugan 28). The special cases were matters for the court, which Cicero further divided into the “conjectural (whether or not an act was committed), *definitional* (how that act should be described in words), *qualitative* (whether mitigating circumstances should determine the case’s outcome), and *translative* (whether the case should be related to another legal venue)” (Dugan 28).<sup>5</sup> Other rhetoricians, such as the pseudo-Augustine and Clodian” (McKeon 6), were said to have openly expressed support for the three-, rather than the four-part, system. Other designs included anywhere from a single to eight separate categories. Some named two, such as such as Posidonius of Rhodes, who set aside one category each for *things* and for words and Apollodorus of Pergamum, who divided stases into areas of fact, and of reflection. On the other extreme were those such as Theodorus of Gadara, who taught five stases at Rhodes. Other systems contained six statuses (*coniectura, qualitas, proprietas,*

---

<sup>5</sup> Further division are based on the controversies and the constitutions (or status) of questions of the three kinds of oratory, (deliberative, judicial, demonstrative).

*quantitas, comparison, translatio*), seven statuses (*coniectura, qualitas, proprietas, leges contrarie, scriptum et voluntas, ratiocinativus, ambiguitas*), and even eight statuses (adding *alii* to the above-listed seven). (Holtsmark 360-362).

Even classical rhetoricians who defended the “three categories” model of stasis were not convincing with their supporting evidence. Largely, their writings contradicted their claim that, although three categories were claimed only two were developed convincingly and substantially. For example, Cicero identified two levels of stasis: of fact and of definition. The characterization of an established fact is said to be the rhetorical question itself, which is “used as a focus for the contrary views of proponents and opponents” (Carter 100). Hermagoras as well concentrated his effort on the development of a two-level process of inquiry. In his conception, the second level, or “category,” in stasis doctrine is represented by the *quaestio*, the rhetorical question which is “used as a focus for the contrary views of proponents and opponents. It is in this level, or stage, where arguments about questions other than proven facts are won or lost because those “presenting the better answer to the question succeed in breaking the stasiatic impasse in their favor” (Carter 100).

The difficulty in developing a clear model of stasis is further complicated because classical rhetoricians were not always “very scrupulous in defining” many rhetorical terms (Leff 24); definitions regarding this subject are often generalized, overlap, contradict, and at times duplicate one other. The ancients referred to the task of preparing arguments as sometimes invention, other times stasis (or status) theory, at other times dialectic (Carroll 157). Richard McKeon notes other variations as well, such as pseudo-Augustine,<sup>6</sup> who referred to stasis inquiries as a line of “rational or logical” questions; and Martianus Capella, who called them “principal status”; and Clodian, who named this a system of “rational status”

---

<sup>6</sup> The collection of sermons once believed to be authored by Augustine of Hippo were discovered, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, to be 14<sup>th</sup>-century forgeries. The unknown author(s) of this work is(are) referred to as Pseudo-Augustine.

(McKeon 6). The matter of clear delineations and definitions of parts of arguments is complicated especially in the cases of *stasis* and *topoi*, both terms of which claim to be a significant, possibly the absolute total component of an argument. It is difficult, if not impossible, to figure out where one component of argument begins and the other ends.

Quintilian went so far as to defend this confusion in *Institutio Oratoria Book III*:

“The view that status (basis), continens (central argument), and indication (point of decision of the judge) are identical is valid and concise. But we should not quibble about technical terms; the main point is to know how to argue the case.” In other words, it does not matter what we call the parts of an argument, it is good enough as long as they work. From a practitioner's point of view, this is, I suppose, sensible logic. However, when relying on language to clearly map out concepts, it becomes trickier. The process and theory I and others term “stasis” has been historically called by so many different names, e.g., status, "rational" questions, principal status, cases, dialectic, peristaseis, and the list continues.

Adding is what we might call the “*stasis/topoi* implosion.” Some rhetoricians say that stasis is the central argument itself, other say it is the action from start to end of conflict, some say simply that stasis *is* the entire argument, and others say this exact same thing about *topos* is the entire argument. Sometimes stasis and *topoi* are used seemingly as interchangeable terms, other times they are defined as different parts of an argument. The words *stasis* and *topoi* are at times used interchangeably to define the entire line of argument, from initial question until eventual resolution. *Topoi* are both the topic *and* the argument, they are “search formulas which tell you how and where to look for argument” as well as the “warrants that guarantee the transition from argument to conclusion” (Kienpointner 226). Likewise, stasis is an entire line of questions, from initial question to eventual resolution, regarding arguments under any topic. Indeed, some of the earlier rhetoricians contributed to this confusion quite notably by seeming to collapse concepts, such as Quintilian, who implode stasis and *topoi* together in the somewhat unhelpful advice that one must consider stasis

questions “in connexion with those ‘places’ in which they most naturally arise” (Butler 237), and Hermagoras, who considered *topoi* as specific to different categories of stasis, which, as he conceived, both identifies the rhetorical issue and leads the rhetor to *topoi* appropriate to that issue.<sup>7</sup>

Foreshadows of what would later be known as “stasis” can be traced back to fifth-century BCE Greece, specifically, to Aristotle whose system of *topoi* that delineated rhetoric into multiple discourses to account for specific rhetorical circumstances would influence the topic-based categories of stasis. But stasis in its own right of both theory and title was not developed until six centuries later, by 1<sup>st</sup> century BC Greek rhetorician Hermagoras of Temnos, who named the system he developed in effort to further refine and clarify Aristotle’s system of rhetoric, which Hermagoras considered to be faulty in that it was unwieldy, unclear, and at times contradictory. Hermagoras’s stasis system worked much the same as Aristotle’s *topoi* in that each system divided arguments into topics-based categories. The difference was that Aristotle’s *topoi* were many, whereas Hermagoras’s system was greatly condensed. And given this example, that a system of *topoi* and a system of stasis work so similarly but are called by different names is a small foreshadowing of what was to come later, but more on that soon, after first clarifying how it is I define and describe stasis, for the purposes of this dissertation project.

In the tune the “invention is the art of finding arguments” maxim, stasis itself is a “doctrine of inquiry” in that it is concerned with the asking of questions. (Carter 100), thus serving its users the means of uncovering arguments on almost any question whatsoever. Stasis is “a powerful guide for helping us to explore what happens to arguments in full rhetorical situations” (Carter 101); it is a “very specific connotation as a comprehensive, systematic, and exhaustive method of invention” (Liu 54). Classical Roman educators such as Cicero and Quintilian considered stasis, also known as “*status theory*,” an important

---

<sup>7</sup> E.g., the act *is* the thing.

pedagogical subject because stasis (literally ‘postures’ or ‘stances’) presents the orator-in-training with an elaborate menu that categorized various likely challenges that an orator might face, and offered suitable responses to these problems (Dugan 28). Recognizing that status works as “a rhetorical *langue* to regulate oratorical *parole*” which can serve as a grammar that its adherents could use to generate persuasive language, (Dugan 27), Cicero lauded its inclusion in rhetorical education. Indeed, many teachers of rhetoric throughout Western history included instruction on this subject since this method of oratorical training was useful because this technique provided students with a pragmatic “system of agonistic argumentation that would allow them to overcome their opponents in court” (Dugan 29); the material generated helped craft demonstrations in support of arguments as to make their cases more persuasive.

Argumentation is given a bad rap by some who see it as being “essentially unstable, uncertain, and unpredictable and [leading] to arbitrary choice” (Bolduc Frank 327). But on the contrary, the problem instead might lie in the lack of clear terminology. Argumentation itself is said to be “built upon a host of stable factors, and we could think of it as a succession of knots rather than a fluid flow” (Bolduc Frank 327). If this “succession of knots” are lines of stasis questions, is this echoing the claim that stasis *is* argumentation? It would seem so. Or at least these “knots” (stasis questions/categories?) operate in the same sequential manner from triggering issue to resolution, in the same manner as stasis works in application. So these “knots” or stasis categories/sequential questioning activities were referred to as “proofs” by those such as Quintilian, who separated them into three categories: necessary, credible, and not impossible (Butler 195). Perhaps one way to conceptualize this is to think of there being several methods to develop these proof-knots. Such as stasis, for example, which is one of a set of discursive techniques used in argumentation which allows its users “to create or increase adherence to theses that are presented for assent” in that it provides material for *demonstration*, which, in argument is the “proof permitting us to come to a conclusion by



moving from the truth of certain propositions to that of other propositions ... with the aid of defined rules of transformation” (Bolduc, Frank 315). In any case, whether we refer to the movement through arguments as knots or stases or proofs, the system works the same: To move from initial question to resolution we must provide statements or evidence that “satisfy the demand of the receiver” in order to achieve resolution; therefore, concern regarding demonstration is always “primarily for the transaction in the argumentation and what functioned to help that transaction” (Crabbe 13). So argument or stasis or knots or proofs work in sequential lines. This seems clear enough. So now we can account for Quintilian’s contribution. He insisted that demonstrations – thought admittedly especially useful in doubtful cases -- *are not arguments*, but require arguments to support them (Butler 195). I suppose this makes sense when we think of the syllogism, which is a form of demonstration. Here is one syllogism you might be familiar with:

All men are mortal (major premise: assumed)

Socrates is a man (minor premise: stated)

Therefore, Socrates is mortal (conclusion: stated)

So are we clear that demonstrations are not arguments? How then do we account for the fact that the syllogism is said to be a syllogism *or other argument* in which a premise or the conclusion is unexpressed; *it is an argument* from “premises that are probable principles” (Murphy 63). So then are demonstrations arguments in themselves, or are they something separate that relies on arguments to support them? The best I can think to describe this case is that stasis is the systematic questioning that drives the logic of syllogisms. It is a decidedly more systematic and critically considered system for demonstration than is its c

ousin, “figures of speech.” Specifically, exaggerated language was used by some rhetoric, such as Gorgias, who is known for his strategy of “juxtaposing ideas, particularly contrasting ideas”; demonstrations technique was to cast ideas “in a dramatic light where their

apparent contrariness can be resolved in the mind or at least accommodated as the natural ambiguity of reality” (Murphy et al 41).

### *Stasis and Today's Arguments*

Throughout its thousands-years-long history, stasis (or topoi or syllogism or simply argument) has been relied upon as a technique to invent materials for legal and political case, and has remained very little changed, other than the adding or subtracting of a category or two. But a handful of contemporary scholars are making notable work by broadening the definitions and uses of stasis. Three scholars in particular have influenced the direction of this dissertation: the teamwork of Patricia Fahnestock and Marie Secor, and the mainly independent contributions of Christian Kock. Of the first set, Fahnestock and Secor has conducted investigations into how discipline-specific values are revealed by observing what stasis (or stases, plural) the particular discipline values. This rhetorical duo illuminates said principle by comparing literary and scientific discourse communities. Literary critics prefer ambiguities and literary discourse tends to reside in stasis of value, since literary critics, who prefer ambiguities over direct teachings, tend to be concerned with making value judgments, e.g., Who was the better poet: Milton or Poe? In contrast, scientific discourses have shorter stasis lines because scientists usually prefer direct teaching and facts over ambiguity. Therefore, scientific discourse is often found in the fact stasis, e.g., a question of fact: At what temperature degrees in Fahrenheit does water boil?

As well, Christian Kock is striving to develop practical application intended to diffuse or eliminate social conflicts resulting from ignorance and misunderstanding by those involved in the debate. Kock suggests that arbitrary qualifiers such as interpretation of ambiguous definitions and laws, as well as even more abstract terms such as level of justification for an action, are embedded with achieved points of stasis. He works under the assumption that the understanding the exact scope and nature of disagreements might dissuade the “characteristic

widening of disagreements where debaters impute imaginary standpoints, policies, reasons, intentions and personality features to each other” and hopes that “greater awareness of the specific type of disagreement in a particular case, debaters may be more conscious of the norms that their own argument relies on, and those of the other side” (Qtd Van Haaften et al 86). He contributes to further development of stasis theory and use under the belief that greater understanding and disseminating of key concepts could help alleviate social disputes caused by lack of familiarity with stasiatic doctrine, since critical understanding of how lines of stasis can move debates might help arguers on both sides narrow down the broad topic to “focused disagreements on more specific, but also more potentially persuasive points” (Kock 91).

Kock gives the example of the heated debate over abortion, arguing this is largely disagreement over definition. “Both sides” of this debate, he insists, do support the idea that humans should not be murdered. So this is not the issue. Instead, the contention is how we define life, specifically in context of when it begins. In said debate, weak line of questioning was undertaken before definitions of “life” were decided upon. To define a fetus as a mere clump of cells or a life in its own right at either conception or at six weeks of development is arbitrary and overlooks the fact that definition alone is not enough to determine if, indeed, life begins at conception, at birth, or at any point in between.

### *Stasis Tomorrow?*

The work of my dissertation project indeed has strong influence from my predecessors, in that it builds off Fahnestock, Secors’, and Kock’s works. Specifically, my own work is influenced by Fahnestock and Secor’s observation of discipline-specific stasis, and by Kock’s desire to encourage wider spread understanding of stasis in effort to alleviate social unrest caused by uninformed and misinformed arguments. Both sets of contemporary theorists recognize the potential use for stasis in other situations other than courtroom or similar legal debates.

Fahnestock and Secor recognize how treatment of the stases is addressed differently in scientific than in literary communities uses these examples to demonstrate how awareness of the stases can help “the kind of sensitivity to audience and discourse community” that we expect from contemporary treatments of rhetorical and composition theory.

A closer look at Fahnestock and Secor’s work illuminates issues I raised in the historical treatment of mislabeling and weak labeling of historical terms, specifically the link I make between Hermagoras’s system of stasis and the likening of them Aristotle’s Topoi, as can be observed in their definition of stasis, that stases are “recurrent kinds of issues” (recall from the historical section in this chapter, Hermagoras’s stasis system was created to “neaten up” Aristotle’s system of Topoi by condensing the topics into (usually) four neat categories. 1. (p. 427) Fahnestock and Secor argue that “classical rhetoricians worked with the genres and types of discourse familiar to their audiences; so should we (427) because “awareness of the stases and the relation between them enriches our understanding of how audience and disciplinary fields are addressed” (437). I agree with their sentiment that modern day rhetoricians ought to work with genres and types of discourse (438), and use this to set up my own proposal – the introduction of a new taxonomy of argument and/or stasis, specifically in the form of a three-use system for undergraduate composition pedagogy. Like Fahnestock and Secor, I, too, wish to make stronger connections “between a classical system of invention and the kind of sensitivity to audience and discourse community that we have come to expect in contemporary treatments of theory in rhetoric and composition.” Who is my audience? First-year composition students, mainly. Who are their audiences? Current and future teachers, employers (academic/professional),

Fahnestock and Secor explain stases as questions that “[sit] between the general outline of an argument, applicable to all arguments regardless of field, described by the Toulmin model, and the very specific lines of argument engendered by the special topoi preferred by specific disciplines” (429). So then my taxonomy is a new stasis. For them, the

stases “simply describe the logic inherent in the development of an issue,” There are different schematics of stases because logics vary from community to community, In the historical section of this chapter, I hinted that these contrasting logics claim responsibility for the at-times wildly different definitions and understanding of argument as a whole and of its parts. If anything, this trend has grown traction in contemporary times, a phenomenon that I elaborate on in this dissertation’s second chapter. I end chapter two by offering a new system of stasis, a new taxonomy of argumentation made up of the qualities shown in Table 1 below:

*Table 1 Qualities and Stasis Questions of Three-Use Argumentation Taxonomy*

TERM	QUALITIES	STASIS QUESTIONS
<b>Academic/professional</b>	Focus on structure of argument itself: The topic is irrelevant except for in context of developing the most appropriate physical structure of argument.	How well is argument put together in a physical, formalistic way??
<b>Advocacy</b>	Whatever techniques get us there are valid, e.g., whatever works as the project is the point.	What is the <i>issue</i> ? (e.g., The point/project/political agenda is the primary concern)
<b>Exploration</b>	What question and multiplicity of “sides” is the main focus	How do we keep pushing the ball forward/keeping the questions coming/extending those conversations about the topic?

What the above table shows is a preview of my own work that comprises this dissertation. My work treats three uses of argument as three broad categories of topoi and hopes to in this way help improve theory by creating a new taxonomy and defining how stasis and warrants might best be examined and reproduced within the individual logic of each of these terms. My suggested taxonomy draws in part, too, from Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s (1969, pp. 65-95) observation that LI arguments “begin in agreement, in shared assumptions of value.” What kinds of things do people value in argument?

But perhaps the meat of this dissertation’s work is contained in the final three chapters. This is because these chapters report on the, bulk of the work of this dissertation project, which is in analyzing a corpus comprised of sixteen recently published undergraduate

composition textbooks, specifically to see how well the lessons contained in them are geared to handle the task of teaching one of the three argument types that comprise my offered taxonomy. Via a discourse analysis of a corpus of first-year textbooks, I first categorize these sixteen textbooks into three “uses” according to authors’ and editors’ definitions and justifications for argument and then investigates how well stasis is developed, both implicitly and explicitly) as to reach use-dependent *Telos*. Via a discourse analysis of a corpus of first-year textbooks, I first categorize the textbooks into three “uses” according to authors’ and editors’ definitions and justifications for argument, and then investigates how well stasis is developed, both implicitly and explicitly) as to reach use-dependent *Telos*. My fifth and final chapter takes inspiration from Kock’s definition-of-life example. Perhaps a more thoughtful strategy that what has been used in the past and is mostly in current use would be to incorporate a “longer line” of stasis, to ask more, and more critical, questions before settling upon a definition of life. We could ask, for example, whether there is evidence of consciousness in an unborn fetus, and if fetuses have the ability to feel pain, and if the existence of a heartbeat offers proof of life—all considerations that would help settle on a clearer definition of stasis. In other words, Kock argues convincingly that, while some might argue that familiarity breeds contempt, perhaps the opposite is true – ignorance does. If this is the case, perhaps education in stasis theory can help alleviate conflict by decreasing misunderstandings between arguers.

## CHAPTER TWO

### TAXONOMY OF CONTEMPORARY ARGUMENTATION MODELS, SYSTEMS OF LOGIC BEHIND THEM, AND WHAT WE CAN DO TO MAKE PRACTICAL SENSE OF THEM

*Argumentation is a vital form of human cognition.*

Phillipe Besnard & Anthony Hunter

#### *Overview*

In the previous chapter, we read that the inventive technique of *stasis* has taken several forms and called by many names throughout the centuries, continuing into today. Likewise, the very concept we call “argumentation” is criticized as remaining “poorly defined or perhaps overly defined by specific sets of assumptions related to research, theoretical work, and teaching and learning” (Newell, et al 274), said to be of concern because inadequate definitions cause instability, lack of clarity, and difficulty with developing methods for reliable, systematic usage. It is understandable that some might be made dizzy by so many distinctive, often competing “logics of inquiry”, as well as the wide range of definitions of argument resulting from these multiple logics (Andriessen 274, 275).

In this second chapter, I advocate for, rather than criticize against, the existence of multiple models and definitions. While Newell’s criticism that argument is “poorly defined or perhaps overly defined” is duly noted, it is also important to realize that argumentation is not a metanarrative, so any work to a one-size-fits-all definition is an effort in futility. The multiple definitions, theories, and uses of argumentation are not flaws of inadequate theorizing caused by conflicting ideological underpinnings of its authors. But *because* there are competing and multiple ideologies, it is appropriate, probably even unavoidable, that various models exist,

since models drive application, and the existence of multiple allows theorists and practitioners alike to choose the model(s) best suited for their purpose(s). Multiplicity should be embraced because systems are use-specific, developed uniquely to accomplish specific goals, and these desired telios vary from community to community. Each system employs (whether explicitly or implicitly) lines of stasis questions uniquely developed to address community-specific questions, to move arguments from initial rhetorical situation to telos, and telios differ from community to community. In fact, I argue that multiplicity of argumentation models and definitions is not only desirable, it is possibly unavoidable, since relativism<sup>8</sup> denies the easy solution of uniformity.

Although I do not condone any attempt to create a one-size-fits-all standard for argumentation, there is need for well organized, clearly developed models, because unchecked, tangential disparity renders any system inchoate and in danger of completely unraveling. In this chapter, then, I begin by describing how community-specific logics give rise to said multitude of often competing, often overlapping concepts of argumentation. Next, I categorize them into three main types, or uses, of arguments as based on common features as to provide a compromise between the cacophony of multitude, and the bland oversimplification of the single definition. Finally, I build from this re-categorization by offering a new taxonomy of argumentation based on three uses – academic/professional, advocacy, and explorative. In the following chapters, I show how this three-use system can be used to 1) judge existing undergraduate argumentation pedagogy, specifically as taught via use of contemporary composition textbooks and 2) be used to evaluate existing and create new lines of argument. Specifically, I conclude by offering a new taxonomy of argument-use types: professional/academic, advocacy, and exploration. In this chapter's concluding section, I elaborate on my design, especially in relation to the guidelines I offer for using my proposed model in ways that are systematic, reliable, and transferable to any range of situations. It

---

<sup>8</sup> Read more about reciprocal influences between argumentation and relativity in chapters 3 and 5.



can, for example, help educators when selecting textbooks. In fact, the major work of this dissertation project employs this three-use model as a rubric to guide an analysis of 16 recently published undergraduate argumentation and composition textbook for determining how well (or not so well) lesson plans offered in textbooks are structured to reach the broad-based *telos* goal stated (either explicitly or implicitly) by the books' authors and editors.

*Community Specific Logics in Arguments, Generally Speaking*

We humans are symbol-using animals, and this language system only works when there exists adequate definition and description of what thing a symbol describes as to link the signifier (the sign) to the signified (its meaning). Therefore, it is unavoidable to begin by responding to the criticism that argument is poorly or overly defined, which we can do by examining the widely accepted definition that argument is

a verbal, social, and rational activity aimed at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by advancing a constellation of propositions justifying or refuting the proposition expressed in the standpoint. ... [This definition] not only refers to the activity of advancing reasons but also to the shorter or longer stretches of discourse or text resulting from it. (Lunsford, Wilson, Eberly 109)

Of this denotation, I admit it is somewhat lacking, as the key concepts of “verbal,” “social,” “rational,” and “reasonable” lack clear definition. Is “verbal” in this case referring to spoken and/or written language alone, to the exclusion of body language, internal dialogues and other forms of silent communications? Can a single entity count as a social network? What do the authors deem rational? How can one judge whether a critic is reasonable? I am especially interested in understanding how “rational” and “reasonable” are verbalized by different communities and used to resolve arguments, important to comprehend because rationality and reasonability are context bound—what is rational and reasonable is uniquely determined by

the *rhetorical situation*, by the context of issue, audience, and set of restraints contained within a specific rhetorical event.

Understanding how the rational and reasonable is determined is an especially important goal, if it is true what some rhetorical scholars insist, that we must “bring forward not further data” in the form of traditional rhetorical appeals and other proofs, but “propositions of a rather different kind: rules, principles, inference-licences” (Bizzel, Herzberg 1417). In other words, what external evidences we attach to arguments is of lesser influence than the rules, principles, and inference-licenses that form systems of logic which in turn guide “rational” progression of arguments. The question of how one might “get there” in an argument is complicated. A one-size-fits-all strategy for doing so does not exist, since the “getting there” depends upon various factors. One must create a travel plan prior to take-off; one must consult a road map containing details of each specific rhetorical situation as to ascertain what logic would be considered the most “rational” path a line of stasis should travel to reach resolution. Logic must be defined contextually when attending to the progression of an argument, because stasis

represented[represents] a community-oriented rhetoric. ... Stasis was[is] a corrective, a way of identifying, controlling, and resolving that conflict within the community. Rhetoric, then, was[is] an act of bringing the members of a community to knowledge—a resolution of a conflict of knowledge. (Carter 99-101)

A knowledge community is made up of participants who have found resolution by sharing the agreement that a Truth has been determined. Truth determines what is then determined to be rational, logical, and reasonable. There are multiple knowledge communities, and each tends to differ in what it considers “rational” and “reasonable” in the context of what arguments they tend to engage in. Logics are contextually bound; they are *rhetorically constructed* out of what issues, opportunities, constraints, and audiences combine uniquely to form a community’s

*rhetorical situation*. Thus constructed, these logics become structures that serve as storehouses for databases, collections of data which materialize into community-specific philosophies; these data collections shape what various groups deem as “logical” argumentation, important because resolution is the desired result of this “activity of advancing reasons” (Lunsford, Wilson, Eberly 109) that is the progression of a stasis line.

An argument’s contextual logic must be adequately attended to in order to reach telos, as active advancement will only take place when the reasons provided for doing so meet the logic of the specific rhetorical situation. Lines of questions are developed uniquely as to sequentially drive an argument from triggering issue to *desired* telos, which at times are to discover its relation to language, at other times to win legal trials and political elections. When the telos is compromise, mitigation and deliberation techniques are likely the most effective techniques, so arguments here would employ stasies made up of lines of sequential questions specifically related to the concern of *compromise*. These question lines are the path to telos in that they pull the conversation from start to finish, from triggering issue to final resolution, Or, consider the topic of a candy forest, and telos as desired by agents of two different communities—one made of up young children and the other consisting of adults. The child’s desired goal might be to get a treat, so stasis lines would be driven by the logic of how best to get that candy. On the other hand, a health-conscious adult might instead avoid the candy forest, as the telos is to avoid fats, sugars, diabetes, also might have places to go and people to see that do not hang out in candy forests.

#### *Further Exploration of Community-specific Logics in Argumentation*

The combination of triggering issue, community’s system of logic, and desired telos, can be read in the structure of any model of argument we choose to look at. For example, in the category I call “professional/academic” uses of argument, we can look to the Sophists and origins of rhetoric: In matters of the early Greek courtrooms, “there was an obvious need for

professional speech writers, who would know how to present the strong points of a case and to counter the arguments of opponents” (Billig 35). Debate is “the archetype of problem-solving in nonscientific spheres of conduct” (Cox Willard xix). Topics were addressed in schools of rhetoric historically as to “advocate for prosecution and defense situations in the [Roman] schools of rhetoric and later in law courts” (Murphy et al 153). Such work continues in today’s academic and professional environments, often tending toward how well argument is structured in terms of classical rhetoric (ethos, pathos, logos) and logic. The quality of argument in terms of structure and ability to persuade target audience, as opposed to the topic in itself, receives primary attention. The focus here is on argument-as-structure is most common in building and evaluating academic, legal, and political debates. The debate education common in universities is clearly linked toward training future politicians and lawyers, as can be seen in textbooks throughout history, such as in the early 20<sup>th</sup>- century instruction manual, in which its author insists about debates that any “analysis must take up both sides of the question and find the main arguments in support of each. He should not be deluded into thinking that it is only necessary to study one side of the question. A lawyer in preparing his case always takes into consideration the position of his opponent” (Ketcham 31). It goes further than the courthouse and political campaign—argument is brought into writing and rhetoric classrooms for more generally pragmatic reasons, which is simply that “the ability to write effective arguments is [thought to be] among the most important skills a student will learn in college “Droge, Ortega Murphy 111),

Other models are more interested in theoretical than in practical applications. Such as those of cognition. Descartes’s famous motto, “I think, therefore I am” is a guiding principle for cognitive-influenced approaches, since members of cognitive groups tend to philosophize that everything we know and can know about the world is binded by our consciousness—what we do not know internally we cannot know at all. These theorists and practitioners typically employ “experimental or quasi- experimental design[s]” in effort to understand to understand

how cognition influences how various argument strategies, tactics, and other schema work to advance arguments (Andriessen 278, 279).

Falling under the category of cognition are language-oriented models. Symbolic cognitivist models are language oriented, as they assume that language itself is the driving factor of all thought (Crale, Newal et al, Tindale, Walton). Halliday identifies these three subsets of the symbolic (qtd. Andriessen 275):

1. *Ideational* is how language is used to organize, understand, and express both experiences and the logic of ideas;
2. *Interpersonal* refers to how language allows participants to take on roles and express an understanding of emotions and attitudes to argue and discuss in a range of literacy events;
3. *Textual* describes how language organizes what the speaker/writer wants to communicate to an audience”

All three of these categories are pronounced in genre theories, which are guided by the belief that genres are tools that help organize our brains. Genres of writing (such as the written argument), then can be usefully developed according to one or more of these three motivations. For reasons of efficiency and clarity, advocates argue that there is a need for further standardization of genres according to the logic of these three subsets (Bawarshi, Clarke, Lunsford).

Also falling under the “cognition” category are orientation models, alternately referred to either as “sender/receiver”, or as “monologic/dialogic”, concentrate on understanding how direction influences arguments. first class, *sender focused* schematics ask questions of what the arguer does, whereas those with a *receiver focus* are guided by the belief that it is most logical to focus instead on an audience’s reaction to said arguments. Relatedly, monologic models tend toward sender focus, and dialogic on receiver.

Regarding the monologic: The sophist Protagoras taught that every individual

receives the world differently through the senses, and then organizes these sensations into knowledge through an internal argument about the meaning of those sensations. [Protagoras] taught that knowledge was the result of this internal struggle, and that this knowledge is then challenged in public discourse as it confronts the knowledge others have attained through their own internal struggle with their own sense experiences (Murphy 37).

For Jamal Bentahar, Bernard Moulin, and Micheline Belanger, monological argument types are concerned with the micro structure, so questions are asked of links between the different components of arguments in effort to understand how tentative proofs move arguments from claim to conclusion (3).

Monologic's counterpart is the dialogic, which highlights the interaction between a set of entities or agents involved in an argument, so is concerned with questions geared toward uncovering how intermediate exchanges of dialogue help involved parties collectively reach conclusions (Bentahar 10). Some schematics of the dialogic are interested in the concept of "dialogic double-voicing as a social practice for building social, intertextual relationships with audiences" (Bakhtin, 1981; Bloome et al, 2009) which focuses on what it considers "the importance of shifting students away from focusing primarily on formulating their own claims to attending to their opponents' claims as well as garnering commitments from their opponents regarding the validity of students' claims: (Andriessen 291). Dialogic theories of argument as social practice are developed from logics that "posit the value of transfer of oral, collaborative interactions, unfolding over time to foster voicing of competing, rival perspectives on an issue, to argumentative writing" (Andriessen 292). Phillippe Besnard and Anthony Hunter walk away from the classroom and turn instead to understanding how dialogic arguments work to construct scientific, social, legal, religious, and other systems.

In a rather stark contrast to the cognitive attention to argumentation development are those I categories as advocacy types. Traces of advocacy use of argument in the classroom

appear in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, specifically, in Ketcham's insistence that the "object of argumentation is not only to induce others to accept our opinions and beliefs in regard to any disputed matter, but to *induce them to act in accordance with our opinions and beliefs* (emphasis mine)" (Ketcham IV). The motive behind this can be read in the work of Charles Bazerman, who implores that we "act beyond" with the acknowledgement that "history is what unfolds around us by our being part of it. If we must resign ourselves to being in history, we have no choice but to be active in the ways our own dim and flickering lights dictate" (46). Activism arguments are about influencing wide-range social changes, influencing the development of history.

Falling under the broad category of public sphere are advocacy-driven models. At least as far back as Cicero, the value of rhetorical education to democracy has been noticed, a point echoed again by Horne in 1933. Many recent scholars also describe argumentation in terms of its social value. For example, Billig sees the value of this practice in advocacy situations, as well as Droge and Ortega-Murphy, who stress that it is necessary for a strong democracy, as well as Eisenberg and Ilardo, who believe that successful practicing of it could effectively mitigate potentially violent situations. At least as far back in history as Ancient Greece, argument was recognized as an effective technique in advocacy (See Cicero). Isocrates (ancient Greek, one of the ten Attic orators 436–338 BCE), for example, saw the potential for rhetoric to benefit society as a whole. He went against the trend of using argument solely to win a legal case by voicing his conviction that "rhetoric must be devoted not only to training for the law courts but to training statesmen who will speak for the benefit of the entire Greek culture" (Murphy 51).

Advocacy is seen in composition classrooms as well, such as in texts in which the intentions of its authors and/or editors are revealed as concerned with finding ways to persuade audience to one's point of view regarding particular concern, such as a political, environmental or social issue. The issue itself, and how to bring audience to agreement with

the author's position on it, is the main focus. As one group of activist teachers of writer points out, "an argument that might convince some of the less sympathetic ones that the presence of African Americans in higher education was of direct concern and benefit to them" (Droge, Murphy 114). We teach students to build and defend arguments so they can have a voice on matters important to them.<sup>9</sup> In order to develop in students "an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (Droge, Ortega Murphy 111), we ask them to argue for or against issues that they care about, such as laws and attitudes about immigration, taxes, or abortion. The unifying logic in these systems are that social justice goals should "define a central-but not exclusive—part of the communication curriculum for our students [therefore they] should be a central—but not necessarily exclusive—part of a faculty member's agenda as a teacher-scholar" (Droge, Murphy 21) and in this way we can incite students to begin "acting to change social conditions that produce ills such as poverty, unemployment, poor housing, and pollution is even more clearly consonant with pedagogical objectives" (Droge, Murphy 112). The telos here is to teach students to "change things that [matter] to them" (Droge, Murphy 113). One method of this is the introduction of service learning courses. Service, Boyer argues, "means far more than simply doing good...It means...[we should] apply knowledge to real-life problems, use that experience to revise [our] theories, and become... 'reflective practitioners'" (Droge, Murphy 111). The central purpose of service learning and the argumentation course is to act upon their shared concern with "the developing in students an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" a goal of argumentation spurred by John Dewey, who saw education in argumentation as "crucial in overcoming the difficulties of technocracy" (Droge, Murphy 111).

---

<sup>9</sup> We live in "a real world and the things we do have real world consequences. To pretend otherwise is to pretend politics don't matter, real oppression doesn't matter, real fights for real rights don't matter" (Thomas).



### *Differences in Logics*

With such diverse motivations of course come contradiction and other forms of opposition among the various modes of thinking. The very idea of what we mean by consciousness is highly debated. There are models of faculty which range from the logocentric notions that there exists clear delineation of reason, of ethics, of emotions (Blair, Bain, Ketcham), to the opposite extreme that there is not and cannot be a pure separation among the faculties; instead there exists a bleeding in among the various points (*Dissoi Logoi*, Gorgias, K. Burke, Williams and Hazen). We can see the struggle over this idea in that theories of argumentation tend to fall into one or the other camp of cognitive or social, but subject-matter experts have noted that the one tends to be ignored because of overemphasis on the other, although the cognitive is embedded in the social. Because social perspectives on argument *do* involve cognition (Andriessen 278), there is a need for research that “integrates a cognitive perspective and a social perspective to study the teaching and learning of argumentative reading and writing in educational contexts” (Burke 297). Specifically at odds are that any social perspective “shifts the focus to the nature and quality of the sociocultural context itself as mediated by uses of oral, analysis, genre, discourse, visual, and digital literacy tools designed to achieve certain rhetorical goals, a viewpoint that criticizes the cognitive perspective in that it “fails to consider how students' knowledge of social, rhetorical, and power dynamics operating in a certain social context can influence the quality or effectiveness of formulating arguments through social construction of persona or ethos, gaining audience identification (Burke qtd. 1969), or voicing of certain discourses, practices constituting particular social contexts (Moje & Lewis qtd., 2007).” (Andriessen 287). Further criticism of cognitive processing research is that it has “focused primarily on comprehending or producing texts as opposed to the effects of framing the argument in terms of dialogic or collaborative interaction involving the use of texts to achieve social action in an authentic rhetorical context involving actual consequences for writers based on audience feedback.”

This grappling over what is “logical” has been apparent in American textbooks since at least the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. During this time period, most argumentation textbooks rejected any “applied formalism that viewed argument-in-use as if it were formal logic” and instead followed Aristotle’s reasoning that “people deliberate about probably, contingent affairs rather than the ‘necessary’ conclusions of syllogisms” (Cox Willard xviii) in this effort of figuring out “ways to account for the specificity and contingency of everyday human arguments” (Droge, Murphy 112). Speaking of this historical moment, Robert Cox and Arthur Willard catalog several of these, commenting on the noticeable upsurge of interest in the early twentieth century to redefine argument principles in terms of “working logics” such as cognitive psychology, discourse analysis, and symbolic interaction (Cox, Willard xiv). This “argument-in-use” movement was a noticeable reaction against the former trend of logic textbooks, whose authors were “sometimes tempted to equate the term ‘fallacious’ with the term ‘invalid,’ and this confuses the elementary student, by suggesting that fallacies are typically formal blunders, rather than (as they more often are) errors of substance” (Bizzel Herzberg 1479).

And such discussion brings up the topic of “correctness: in arguments. *Is* correctness something we can clearly define and lay out in the classroom texts? We’d have to first decide what we mean by correct. Is it, as some believe, a static field, e.g., formalistic, attention to rules of genre (Clarke) or rules relating to social behavior (Eisenberg, Illardo)? Or is correctness a kairotic instance, the right tool for the right moment (Carter, Tindale, Williams)?

Debates about what is “correct” in argument can be seen in public-sphere debates, as one of many examples. Patricia Roberts-Miller criticizes the ideal public sphere as envisioned by Enlightenment theorists, in which “intellectually autonomous interlocutors judge one another’s arguments purely on the basis of how well they are presented, rather than who presents them. She objects to this line of argument because “the standards are not themselves impartial, that the public sphere is a liberatory and inclusive only to the extent that all

participants adopt the ethos of a European white male” (19). She argues against the assumption that classical argument is necessary for life in the polis, and in the classroom students should participate in discourses where shared beliefs and actions are determined cooperatively. She challenges the notion of consistency, since, as opposed to the slave-based polis of Athens “which put a premium on uniformity,” the United States “claims to value difference” (3).

What she is hinting at is the idea of “correct” ethics as “the right thing to do” but as Billig points out, “advocacy includes arguments about consistency, as we accuse our opponents of inconsistency and claim that our own stances are impeccably consistent (Billig 157). This idea relates to ideas of correctness seemingly behind the notion that, while some scholars insist that one must profess a belief in correctness, that an argument’s purpose is to convey a standpoint, and to do so “an utterance must express a positive or a negative position with response to a certain proposition” (Lunsford, Wilson, Eberly, eds. 110). But this overlooks argument as a form of deliberation or exploration. And there is notable pushback in the classroom, in that several textbooks also emphasize argumentation’s explorative purpose, in which the focus is on helping students explore multiple perspectives on an issue so they can develop original, compelling cases. Emphasis is on exploration and personal development as opposed to audience, topic, or mechanical structure of the argument, an ideology driven by the idea that analysis of logical form will serve as a “guide to correct patterns of thought and decision” (Cox Willard xviii). In other words, it will lead to a Truth, an instance of Correctness.

Of course, others challenge this idea of Correctness as an Archetype, as a Single Form to fit all circumstances. Archetypes represent Absolutism, and, “[a]bsolute statements (for example, John is a bad student) may conceal more than they reveal [because] they fail to consider that not all members of a group are the same” (Eisenberg, Ilardo 30). Much more noticeable, and at least as problematic, is what Wayne Booth calls “win rhetoric” (43) which is

a form of forcing one's own idea of what is "correct" in thought, in presentation, in understanding some particle of Truth. The opposition is seen in the composition classroom.

Although teachers may recognize the importance of argumentative reading and writing as central to acquiring academic literacies, they are often leery of introducing what may evolve into conflict and one-upmanship employed in the media, that is, argument consisting of competitive, combative debate that leads to an adversarial frame of mind. In addition, given their experiences with arguments in the media, students may then assume that in formulating claims, they simply need to summarize their claims to achieve the goal of convincing audiences without providing supporting evidence], considering counterarguments, or changing their own or others' stances on an issue. On the other hand, the ability to identify the underlying argument, and its claims, warrants, and evidence, in reading and the ability to compose a high-quality argument, and its claims, warrants, and evidence, in writing are critical skills for academic success, as Andriessen points out. And this is a valid concern in address of what I call the "advocacy and relativism" issue, that, on the one hand, there is need for a process of systematic assent, in order to establish values, which is done in the same way "we establish anything: by earning communal validation through trying them out on other men' ... The answer, therefore, to the problems in the public sphere is to 'build new rhetorical communities,' for if we do not 'every institution we care about will die'" (Williams 122).

Not surprisingly, there is backlash by those who criticize the consideration of this relativistic viewpoint, in which "it is perfectly proper and acceptable of one to push ahead with the advocacy of one's own group, discounting opposing views as merely the biases of other interest groups" (Walton xv), even though such one-sided advocacy "is only a basis for negative criticism of the argument in some cases" because "whenever an argument is advocated, that argument is based on and expressed the commitments and/or interests of the proponent who advocated it" (Walton xix).

Audience-directed social perspectives, too, use oral, analysis, genre, discourse, visual, and digital literacy tools designed to address sociocultural issues as to “achieve certain rhetorical goals” (Andriessen 287). In addition to advocacy, other social goals include using argument to reach “mature reasoning” (Knoblauch, Roberts-Miller), to compromise or otherwise mitigate opposition (Eiseberg and Ilardo); even as a device for leveling out power imbalances in society (Cicero, Wander, Fitts & France). Influences of audience and other social concerns are visible in the logics what drives many arguments about pedagogy as well. One such example comes from Patricia Roberts-Miller of which, speaking on the goal of improving instruction in argumentation, insists that more attention needs to be given to the development of theories and practices that address the political. She criticizes the multitude of argumentation textbooks which “typically stress that argument is important in a democracy,” but books “do not make clear which model of democracy they imagine” suggesting that this oversight indicates that is “very little (if any)” awareness that different models exist. She insists there is a need to develop composition textbooks that are consistent with the goals as according to these six types of public spheres:

1. Liberal, in which rational discourse is used to address triggering issues in effort to “determine what is in the universal best interest” for a community whose logic insists that members “ignore their own particular situations and needs” while at the same time are “able to resist the pressures of conformity, to think critically about their own traditions, to stand above and away from the crowd” (4).
2. Technocracy, which consists of a knowledge community whose logic includes the assumption that “policy questions are fundamentally technical questions” and so Telos is best reached by “letting technical experts make the decision, or through using the public sphere for the dissemination of technical information that can then inform the decisions of the general public” (4).

3. Interest-based, of which “people can and should look to their own self-interest in regard to public policies” (5).
4. Agonistic models are rhetorical; the strongest argument made among competing views is deemed the winner.
5. Communitarian models follow a logic based on the belief that “democracy depends on a sociohistorically constructed ethos that must be consciously enriched” (5).
6. Deliberative, made up of members who use strategies such as narrative techniques and emotional appeals in effort “to articulate a system in which issues would be settled by who makes the best argument, not who has the most power” (5).

Of course, true to the concept of argumentation itself, there is disagreement as to whether it is the sender, or instead it is the receiver, that is most influential in moving arguments from claim to conclusion. Of this, Richard Crable critiques what he considers to be a lack of scholarly attention to the message’s receiver. Successful delivery of a communication, he insists depends upon the receiver’s response, not on the individual who advances a claim (vi). Again, we must ask ourselves: what *do* we have to go on? Transfer of a message is far too complex to assume it can be thoroughly analyzed by surgically separating the sender/monologic from the receiver/dialogic and analyzing one or the other separately on the micro-structure level, because how arguments move in communication acts is far too complex to understand in terms of any artificially constructed dichotomy. We need to understand the space in between; we need to know how sender and receiver interaction works in dialogue to move any argument from triggering issue to the telos of resolution.

Community-specific logics in relation to use-value contain questions intended to figure out how arguments are interpreted and responded to by a message’s receiver (vi). For example, Philippe Besnard and Anthony Hunter’s taxonomic model consist of these six subcategories of the monological: the factual, the positional, the persuasional, the prevocational, the speculative, the auto-argumental, and last but not least, a category

affectionately called the “one-to-many”(itionals) (Besnard Hunter 10). Other models include Douglas Walton and Erik Krabbe’s six subcategories of the dialectic, which are: persuasion, inquiry, discovery, negotiation, information-seeking, deliberation, and the eristic.

### *Tying them All Together and Proposing a Use-Based Taxonomy of Argumentation*

It is important to make the link between these often disparate and competing, often overlapping or otherwise redundant definitions of and use-descriptions for models of argument and the three-use system I wish to contribute for widespread use in the field of written argumentation studies. But to best make the link, it might be most helpful to first move forward by describing what I mean by my three uses, then jump slightly back by providing the link between my uses and some of the models of argument I’ve been discussing here. I continue this dissertation’s subsequent chapters by elaborating upon my formula model, especially in relation to this project’s main work, which is an analysis of stasis use in some thirty-odd undergraduate textbooks, using a rating system based on guidelines I set according to my share of the conviction that “successful arguments are built from plausible lines of argument rather than formal reasoning” (Williams 3). I further Toulmin’s work, who calls for the study of argument-in-use (A-I-U). AIU is “plausible lines of argument, not formal reasoning”; it is a practical model of group argument. This gives way to my own proposed taxonomy of three use-based models of argumentation:

- 1) Academic/advocacy: Looks to how well argument is structured in terms of classical rhetoric (ethos, pathos, logos). The quality of argument in terms of structure and ability to persuade target audience, as opposed to the topic in itself, receives primary attention. The focus on argument-as-structure is most common in building and evaluating academic, legal, and political debates.

- 2) Explorative: Concerned with finding ways to persuade an audience to one's point of view regarding a particular concern, such as a political, environmental, or social issue. The issue itself, and how to bring audiences into agreement with the rhetor's position on it, is the main focus.
- 3) Advocacy: Focuses on exploring multiple perspectives on an issue as to develop original, compelling cases. Emphasis is on exploration and personal development, e.g., knowledge for knowledge's sake, as opposed to audience, topic, or mechanical structure of an argument.

Having defined my terms accordingly, I link many of the currently existing conceptions of argumentation with my three-use taxonomy, as shown in Appendix 1.

The next chapters that I urge you forward in your reading contain elaboration on the above, as well as many other details of this proposed taxonomy, specifically as related to the major work of this dissertation, which is to use this system in analyzing the level of success that composition and argumentation undergraduate textbooks develop stasis lines in relation to the professed "logic" and goals of each book.



## CHAPTER THREE

### THE DESIGN, RESULTS, AND AN ANALYTICAL DISCUSSION OF THIS STUDY

#### *Introduction*

In Chapter One, I recounted the historical progression of argumentation, specifically of stasis in argumentation, largely in effort to lay groundwork for Chapter Two, in which I drew a map linking historical divergences and parallels to contemporary taxonomic and conceptual overlaps and contradictions evident in today's argumentation theories and practices. In Chapter Two, I make the connection between the multitude conceptions of argument and community-specific logic. Multiplicity evolved – and is to an extent necessary – because of use value; there are many conceptions of argument because arguments are used for so many different purposes. Because some level of flexibility is needed, I express disinterest in the concept of Argument as Archetype held in the minds of those who would place argument under a single, unchanging definition, as suggested by many scholars. At the same time, the current taxonomy is inefficient as it lacks clarity and precision. I ended Chapter Two by suggesting as a compromise a taxonomy made up of three use-based types of argumentation<sup>10</sup> and by offering to apply this three-use schematic to analyze the level of competency these arguments are taught via undergraduate argumentation textbooks.

This third chapter describes the study I designed to undertake the textbook analysis (see chapter 4 for results). I choose to focus my research specifically on argumentation because the importance of teaching college students how to write effective arguments (Besnard, Hunter) is so important that most scholars, teachers, and other thinkers insist that the ability to do so is among the most – if not *the* most – important skills a student will learn

---

<sup>10</sup> These three types are: 1) academic/professional; 2) advocacy; 3) explorative.

in college. But, as discussed in previous chapters, argumentation remains “poorly defined or perhaps overly defined by specific sets of assumptions related to research, theoretical work, and teaching and learning” (Newell, et al.). It is difficult to develop sound pedagogy in a discipline of which its very terms remain misunderstood due to lack of clear definitions and illustrations. Undoubtedly, current argumentation pedagogy is a task at which we are failing, and there remains an “essential need” to improve instruction in the practice of argument (Droge, Ortega-Murphy). The problem described thus provides impetus for this study, in which I seek answers for the following research questions:

- i) In what ways can exigencies/triggering issues, ideologies/community-specific logics, and teloi/desired outcomes be traced in how textbook authors and publishers define and justify written argumentation, as seen in first-year composition textbooks’ introductions and/or prefaces?
- ii) How can these definitions and justifications be classified as to re-group according to my three-use taxonomy?
- iii) How effectively are lessons in the books designed, pedagogically speaking, as to teach students to write argument , as judged by my three-use system?

### *Methodology*

This textual analysis aims to be practical in that the emphasis is on action, and the necessity for conceiving of methods for solving problems. I began my initial research by scanning multiple sources on argumentation theories and practices as to gain an overview of the topic and to gather preliminary data. As the study progresses, I transition to analyzing textbooks, or sections of textbooks, which involves carefully selecting, coding, and evaluating data segments. The data from my study is meant to serve as a guide for educators to consult when evaluating textbooks for possible classroom adoption. I believe the results of my study have the potential to be of great benefit to the field of rhetoric and composition pedagogy, because

it offers a clearer taxonomy that I use to evaluate existing books to see how well they address pedagogical needs according to this system. Further, in the final chapter of this dissertation, I offer a formula that can be used to create and evaluate arguments of all genres and contexts.

### *Study Population*

But why textbooks, you ask? Why not evaluate classroom teaching techniques, or individual lesson plans, or syllabi, or resulting student essays? I chose textbooks not only because of their widespread, fairly consistent use, but also because they represent what is quintessential on subject matter. In her essay “Genre as Social Action,” Caroline Miller points out that genre is more than a formal entity because it is “fully rhetorical, a point of connection between intention and effect, an aspect of social action” (25). Genre is distinct from form because it has an exigence. Genre-specific rules link form to meaning as they influence our interpretations. So the phrase “She died last night” has a different meaning in a news story than in a zombie flick or formal poem. She really died in last night’s news, but today is semi-alive as a zombie, and the poem might mean this death-and-revival as a metaphor for love. In this dissertation study, I chose to investigate the genre of textbook because the textbooks commonly used in composition classrooms today have been written, reviewed and published by field experts. This authority lends weight to the medium of the course textbook, as it provides the quintessential model for teaching the written argument. It is because of this authorial weight the textbook carries that I chose this genre to use as the study population for the investigation described by this dissertation.

The books that make up my corpus were obtained at academic conferences on composition studies or sent directly to me by publishers. I selected to include in this study only those with publication dates no older than 2010, because recently published books represent current conversations among scholars in the field, and are those most in use by students in today’s classrooms. My corpus consists of a collection of 16 textbooks obtained

from publishers at academic conferences, or mailed to me directly. I chose the amount of 16 because this includes enough data from different texts as to work with and against one another as reliability and validity checks, but it is not such a large number of textbooks as to overwhelm or otherwise water down data results. See Table 1, below, for an itemization of the books under review.

*Table 2: Itemization of the Textbook Corpus*

	<b>Title</b>	<b>Publication year</b>	<b>Author(s)/Editor(s)</b>
1.	<i>Aims of Argument, The</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2011 (1995)	Timothy Crusius, Carolyn Channell
2.	<i>A Little Argument</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> edition)	2013 (2010)	Lester Faigley, Jack Selzer
3.	<i>A Practical Study of Argument</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2014 (2005)	Trudy Govier
4.	<i>Argument</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed)	2013 (2011)	John Gooch, Dorothy Seyler
5.	<i>Argumentation : Understanding and Shaping Arguments</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2011 (1995)	James A. Herrick
6.	<i>College Argument: Understanding the Genre</i>	2010	Irene L. Clark
7.	<i>Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing</i> (8 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2014 (2005)	Sylvan Barnet, Hugo Bedau
8.	<i>Dialogues: An Argument Rhetoric and Reader</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2011 (2007)	Gary Goshgarian, Kathleen Krueger
9.	<i>Elements of Argument</i> (10 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2012 (2003)	Annette T. Rottenberg, Donna Haisty Winchell)
10.	<i>Everything's an argument</i> (6 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2013 (2004)	Andrea A. Lunsford, John J. Ruskiewicz
11.	<i>From Critical Thinking to Argument</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2014 (2005)	Sylvan Barnet, Hugo Bedau
12.	<i>Inventing Argument</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> ed)	2013 (2006)	John Mauk, John Metz
13.	<i>Purposeful Argument, The</i>	2012	Harry Phillips, Patricia Bostian
14.	<i>Read, Reason, Write</i> (10 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2012 (1984)	Dorothy U. Seyler
15.	<i>They Say/I Say</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed)	2012 (2006)	Gerald Graff, Cathy Birkenstein, Russel Durst
16.	<i>Well-Crafted Argument, The</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> ed)	2014 (2008)	Fred D. White, Simone J. Billings

*Specific Features of the Three Uses of Argumentation*

I concluded the previous chapter by sketching out definitions for the three uses of arguments – academic/professional, advocacy, and explorative – that comprise my taxonomy. In this section I elaborate on the features of each category, as this serve as methodology to framework the coding system I use to classify each textbook under one of my three categories.<sup>11</sup>

### Academic/Professional

Academic and professional arguments are focused on structure mainly or wholly in itself. How well is the argument put together? The topic is irrelevant except for in context of developing the most appropriate physical structure of argument. This first category acknowledges claims such as one made by communication scholar Richard E. Crable, that most communication activity in argumentation is not concerned with the claim itself, but instead on the reasons that relate to the claim, since no claim would be accepted without some sort of reason why it should be accepted (9). Richard Willard also reveals his preference to technique over content, but with focus on the agency of an audience. He insists that “Whether or not an argument is valid is less interesting ... than the reasons actors in a particular field think it valid” (15). In both cases, I equate these “reasons” to the mechanical, to the focus on developing the physical structure of an argument. The nod at technique over topic can be seen in the eristic as conceived by Plato and Aristotle as well. For my purpose, it is not as important to note that they both saw eristic argumentation as “inherently deceptive and contentious” as it is to note that the goal is to “defeat the other party by *seeming to have the strongest argument*” (Walton 3) (emphasis mine). In other words, whether the subject being argued is fair or foul is of lesser note than the fact that a well-crafted argument can be used to defeat the other part. One example of this can be seen in Cicero’s practice, who achieved forensic successes by

---

<sup>11</sup> See Table 2 for a brief description of each type, explained in terms of definition, evaluation, and telos.

“studying his adversary’s case with as great, if not still greater, intensity than even his own” (Kruger 213). It is easier to construct a successful eristic argument of one’s own if one knows exactly what points the adversary will raise that you will need to argue against.

### Advocacy

This second type is opposite in a key way to its predecessor, in that the topic itself – the point, the project, the political agenda – is of utmost importance. These arguments are ethical, they intend to have consequences, they are in search of local and global “good” in physical landscapes, the *telo*i are to shape material conditions in an observable way. These are arguments about *things*, about issues and controversies and opinions, and these things take center stage. These things should be important enough in their own right to warrant such attention, so arguments in this category are crafted to draw as much attention as possible to the focus of discussion. An example of such argument is the highly magnified image of an aborted fetus used by some anti-abortion activists. The image is the argument in itself – it is claim, reason, evidence, and conclusion all in itself. Because of this, the activist is the counterargument to Crable, and his emphasis on reasons over claims, and to Willard, with his emphasis on audience’s agency over topics. Instead, we follow the lead of those like Charles Bazerman, who implores that we use argument as a tool to “act beyond” with the acknowledgement that “history is what unfolds around us by our being part of it” (46). To do otherwise, if we must “resign ourselves to being in history” then we leave ourselves with “no choice but to be active in the ways of our own dim and flickering lights dictate” (46, 47). The activist argument extends from concept of *Gadugi*, which is Cherokee for “working together.” Ellen Cushman describes the *Gadugi* as “an ethic that weds praxis and belief,” made possible by rhetorical activism (Qtd. Kahn, Lee 4).

### Explorative

This final category focuses neither on the reasons the claim should be accepted, as does the Academic/Professional, nor on the issue is itself, as with the Advocacy, but rather on what *not* known about the topic being argued. Questions are the focal point and multiplicity is the driving ideology. These questions are driven by the main question of: How do we keep pushing the ball forward so the questions keep coming, keep extending those lines of stasis? This type is a conscious pushback against the tendency to provide “rationalizations,” defined by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca as justifications given *ex post facto* for decisions already made, the “insertion of the conclusion into a technical framework.” Subject-matter philosophical and practical concerns alike must “recognize the facts of relativity” among fields, because “[t]he retreat [to a particular field] shuts off debate, or leaves it at a standstill, since it demands from the public a passive acquiescence to a field of authority” (Williams). The practice of argumentation becomes “mere exhibition” and results in “premature closure of inquiry” (Faules, Rieke). To counteract the rationalization effect, I draw upon the concept of “negative capability,” described by poet John Keats as that ability of humans to be capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, and doubts, without feeling the need to reach out after fact and reason (Bate). One who does rely on categories, Keats argued remains “content with half-knowledge” owing largely to the determination to “make up [one’s] mind about everything (Bate). Negative capability involves “a very active participation in the existence, work, and fortune of the object toward which he has extended his sympathy” (Bate 44). In fact, Keats insisted that the “only means of strengthening one’s intellect is to make up one’s mind about nothing—to let the mind be a thoroughfare for all thoughts” (Bate 18). He believed that categorizing and labeling retards the intellect, rendering it static. A man who does rely on categories, he argued, remain “content with half-knowledge” owing largely to his determination to “make up his mind about everything.”

*Study Design for Phase 1: Classifying the Textbooks According to the Three-Use Taxonomy*

Table 3, below, summarizes and defines the three categories of argument that are contained in my taxonomy.

*Table 3: Three Uses Summarized and Defined*

<b>FACT: What is it?</b>	<b>DEFINITION: How is it defined?</b>	<b>EVALUATION: What are its qualities?</b>	<b>TELOS: What outcome is expected/hoped for?</b>
<b>Academic/ Professional</b>	An argument used in an academic and/or professional setting.	Focus is on structure (e.g., genre, rhetorical appeals, claims, grounds, warrants)	Search for employment/success in employment and/or success in school and/or employment.
<b>Advocacy</b>	An argument used to advocate for or against a current or future event.	Focus is on the issue in itself and how to bring audience to agreement with author's position on it (versus attn to structure).	Search for local "good". To persuade an audience to take action on concerns such as political, environmental, and social issues.
<b>Exploration</b>	An argument used as a form of investigation.	Focus is on exploring the issue, topic, or idea in itself, little to no attention is paid to persuade an external audience.	Search for Truth/truths. To explore an issue, topic, or idea rather than to persuade an audience.

*Coding: Categorizing the Textbooks According to the Three-Use Taxonomy*

Having clear models of the three uses of arguments I define in my taxonomy allows us to embark on the next task, which is to determine what argument type to categorize it under. I do so by analyzing introductions and editors notes in a process similar to how stasis works in practice, which is by asking these four questions:

- i. Definition: How is argument defined in the textbook?
- ii. Triggering issue: To what is it said that arguments are in response?
- iii. Quality: What features are said make the argument good (or bad?)
- iv. Telos: What is the goal of this argument? What should be done about the issue?

I put these questions through the lens of my three-use taxonomy to categorize the textbooks that make up my corpus; to answer the questions above means to first extrapolate on the



rationale behind my three uses, specifically in terms of how the specific examples offered in Table 4 (below) draw from them:

1. My category of *Academic/Professional* is concerned with the physical structure of arguments, following the rationale that, in academic and professional settings, it is the structure of an argument in itself that will be seen as most persuasive. An academic paper will be judged not necessarily on what is argued, but how well it is argued. Legal and political battles are won or lost for the same reasons. Therefore, when examining the introductions and/or first chapters of my textbook corpus, I relied on key terms that focused on the pedagogical and other work-place concerns, mainly how the argument is physically structured (including its use of rhetorical appeals).
2. My conception of the *advocacy* category stems from the idea that such arguments are concerned with content over form. The issue in itself is fore fronted; the structure of the argument in favor of, or against, a topic (e.g. reproductive rights, animal and gay rights) is given priority over an argument's physical structure in terms of appeals, claims, warrants, and backings. Therefore, as far as advocacy as a category in my three-use taxonomy, I chose the broad concepts of democracy, power/win, and ethics/causes, as these ideas are ideological in their concern, meaning the main focus of such arguments surround the concept itself (e.g., vote for this bill to pass/not pass, get inspired to save the whales, etc.), so key coding phrases surrounded topics/issues themselves; while mechanical structure of an argument is not discounted, it is not the main concern when building an argument.
3. Arguments that I classify as "explorative" are concerned with discovery for discovery's sake. The emphasis is on exploration, on learning about an issue, and this takes priority over an argument's physical structure, as well as the topic in itself. Therefore, exploration arguments necessarily disregard (or at least subsume) physical and audience concerns, since the focus is not on influencing external audiences as to

win an argument, but instead is to treat any “argument” is a question to be answered.

Therefore, key words to help define a textbook as explorative surround the idea of discovery.

*Table 4: Coding Scheme for Phase One*

<b>CODING SCHEME FOR PHASE ONE: CLASSIFYING ACCORDING TO THREE-USE TAXONOMY</b>				
<b>Academic/ Professional</b>	<b>codes</b>	PED (pedagogy)	STRC (structure)	RTRI (rhetorical appeals)
	<b>terms and phrase bites</b>	“conventional academic writing skills” “genre” “of practical value” “effective classroom text” “academic discourse” “skill development” “arguments in college and in the workplace”	“argument is a claim supported by reason” “find conclusions and premises” “how is the thesis developed and supported?” “induction, deduction, analogy, logical fallacies”	“successful arguments blend logos, ethos, and pathos” “it is your job to explain why your readers should consider it important” “convincing evidence” “goal is to win adherence of audience”
<b>Advocacy</b>	<b>codes</b>	DEMO (democracy/public sphere)	PWR (power/win)	ETHC (ethics/causes)
	<b>terms and phrase bites</b>	“good public discourse” “private responsibility ... for public good” “find your place among others” “join worldwide conversation” “public debate” “free and pluralistic society”	“the capacity to wield influence to shape important decisions” “strategies and tactics” “stake, defend, and justify your claim” “stronger, more focused arguments” “setting out our views”	“moral responsibilities” “advocacy ethics” “be more effective advocates” “important global issues” “subjects people care about”
<b>Explorative</b>	<b>codes</b>	AWAR (awareness)	FRMV (forward movement)	ORIG (originality)
	<b>terms and phrase bites</b>	criticism of “inattention” arguments are <i>not</i> “only monologs of advocacy” “aware of why people argue” “mature decisions are	“inquiry is dialectic” argument is a “place to begin” “all claims are answers to questions” arguments have “aims”	“argument is open-ended and creative” “challenge unexamined beliefs” “process starts with imagination” “this book is about getting ideas”

		thoughtful” “open-minded reasoning” “writing as a way of thinking”		“help students develop ... original ideas” “innovative”
--	--	--	--	---

*Study Design for Phase 1: Evaluating Select Lessons for Effective Pedagogy*

Once the books have been categorized accordingly, the task is to figure out how effective the lessons each contains are developed as to teach argumentation toward the definition as defined in my taxonomy. For this part of the project, I select chapters that explain what argument *\*is\** e.g. chapters that discuss "elements," "characteristics," "analyzing," "structure," "aims," etc., as these are most attentive to this thing called argument. I eliminate from the study chapters on fallacies, supplemental readings, finding sources, grammar/mechanics, and specific types of arguments (e.g., Toulmin, Rogerian, Aristotilian) as these do not deal directly with argument as conceived by an individual book's author(s)/editor(s), except for in a rare couple of cases when it is stated explicitly "We follow the Toulmin approach to argument in this book." The lessons selected for evaluation I then rank on a scale of 1 to 3 according to criteria I established, which has been specified according to the unique features of each of the three categories. This average becomes the overall score for the textbook. The following tables, 5, 6, and 7, are the rubrics I use for scoring purposes.

*Table 5: Rubric for Academic/Professional Category*

ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL			
	excellent or nearly so (score of 3)	solid or competent (score of 2)	barely passing (score of 1)
Attention to the Rhetoric- al Situation	The lesson makes it clear to readers as to the purpose of the assignment and contains information that illustrates rhetorical knowledge, composing process, and/or reflective learning for the student. Included in	The textbook includes apt decisions, with a couple of lapses, for this assessment situation. For almost all sections, the lesson includes passages that adequately contribute to the student's rhetorical knowledge, composing process, and/or reflective learning. The lesson	The textbook does not show evidence of apt decisions in light of this assessment situation, or there are several lapses. There are no entries dedicated to helping develop the writer's attention to the rhetorical situation. Terms are either missing

	the lesson are industry terms (e.g., genre, audience, revision, etc.), which are clearly defined.	provides competent definition of industry-specific terms (e.g., genre, audience, revision, etc.).	or incompetently defined.
Use of appeals (e.g., ethos, pathos, logos to persuade audience[s])	Each lesson clearly geared toward helping students gain mastery of using particular rhetorical strategies in certain contexts, e.g., situation/audience(s) in relation to one another.	Most of the lessons provide clear instruction meant to help students develop the skills to effectively use appeals as to achieve greatest rhetorical effect, but some lessons might inadequately do so.	The lessons do not contain any or adequate attention to helping students develop appeals as to persuade audience(s).
Conventions & Craft	The text provides clear and detailed explanations on how to use and document sources, and provides lessons on proper usage of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics, as appropriate for the assignment	The lesson may leave the reader with one or two questions about sources or documentation. There may be some, but underdeveloped or otherwise misleading, instructions on grammar, punctuation, or mechanics that may impede meaning somewhat.	The text has little to no instruction on sources or documentation, or on usage of grammar, punctuation, or mechanics.

*Table 6: Rubric for Advocacy Category*

ADVOCACY			
	<b>excellent or nearly so (score of 3)</b>	<b>solid or competent (score of 2)</b>	<b>barely passing (score of 1)</b>
Attention to the Rhetorical Situation	The lesson makes it clear to readers as to the purpose of the assignment and contains information that illustrates rhetorical knowledge, composing process, and/or reflective learning for the student, specifically as to attend an argument of advocacy.	The textbook includes apt decisions, with a couple of lapses, for this assessment situation. For almost all sections, the lesson includes passages that adequately contribute to the student's rhetorical knowledge of situations most appropriately responded to via use of the advocacy argument.	The textbook does not show evidence of apt decisions in light of this assessment situation, or there are several lapses. There are no entries dedicated to helping develop the student's ability to write an argument of advocacy.

Is back-ground on topic(s) detailed and well-researched enough as to help students make informed opinions?	There is ample background on the topic on question so that a student can make a fully informed decision as to attitude or opinion about it. In addition, students are also pointed to print or web sources for further reading.	Some information is provided on the topic so that a student can make a fully informed decision as to attitude or opinion about it, but it is not extensive nor is the student referred to other resources.	Very little or no background is provided (e.g., background limited to a single sentence or paragraph). ; student is positioned to make uninformed judgment about the topic. No data on how to access outside reading sources regarding the topic are provided.
To what extent does the lesson succeed in championing / defending a position regarding the subject?	There is no question what position the author(s)/editor(s) hold regarding the topic under consideration. Ample and effective uses of ethos, pathos, and logos are evident.	The author(s)'s editor(s)'s position is clear, but it may be weakened due to strong arguments from opposition and/or rhetorical tropes are used with some but not tremendous effect.	The author(s)'s editor(s)'s position is misleading, confusing, or otherwise obscuring attempts at taking a clear position. Use of ethos, pathos, and logos are missing or inadequately used.

*Table 7: Rubric for Explorative Category*

<b>EXPLORATIVE</b>			
	<b>excellent or nearly so (score of 3)</b>	<b>solid or competent (score of 2)</b>	<b>barely passing (score of 1)</b>
Attention to the Rhetorical Situation	The lesson makes it clear to readers as to the purpose of the assignment that clearly attends to exploration in response to an issue.	The textbook includes apt instruction, with a couple of lapses, for this assessment situation. For almost all sections, the lessons include are designed to adequately contribute to the student's rhetorical knowledge and composing process of the explorative argument.	The textbook does not show evidence of apt instruction in light of this assessment situation, or there are several lapses. There are no entries dedicated to helping develop the writer's attention to the rhetorical situation surrounding an explorative argument.
How many relevant questions does the lesson plan ask a student to consider before	The student is asked to consider numerous questions related to the topic before encouraged to write a tentative thesis.	The student is asked to consider some, but not an appropriate number of questions, and/or the questions student is asked to consider are not exploratory in nature.	The student is not asked to explore the topic via the asking of questions, and/or is not led through questions, but instead told what to think about issue.

forming a thesis?			
Is the lesson plan fair, as in, does it encourage the student to truly consider all sides of the argument evenly?	Multiple viewpoints on the same issue are presented in a balanced manner; no suggestion of bias. Possibly, starkly contrasting “opposing” viewpoints are presented in a balanced manner, but alternative or middle ground viewpoints are not addressed.	Various viewpoints on the topic are provided, but there is some suggestion of bias, either intentionally on the part of the author(s) or editor(s), or that one reading is stronger or otherwise presents a better case than a work supporting another viewpoint.	“The other side” of the argument is presented, but is done so in a way that suggests bias on the part of the author(s) and/or editor(s). Only one viewpoint is presented, and is done so in a way that is exaggeratedly biased either in favor for, or against, the topic at hand.

### *Classifying and Scoring the Textbooks: Academic/Professional*

Having designed the study, we can now classify and rank the textbooks as per the guidelines set above.<sup>12</sup> I was not surprised to discover that most of the books comprising the corpus were academic/professional in nature, as the textbooks were developed for use in academia, specifically in undergraduate classrooms made up of students of various majors, most of whom are assumed to seek professional jobs at the time of graduation, rather than advance to graduate studies in academia. In fact, more than half of my books – nine out of sixteen – fall under the academic/professional category. Table 8, below, lists these nine books, as ranked according to the criteria listed in this chapter’s second and third tables.

*Table 8: Scores for the Academic/Professional Textbooks*

Title	Author	Avgd. Score
<i>A Little Argument</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed.)	by Lester Faigley and Jack Selzer	1.875/3
<i>A Practical Study of Argument</i> (7th ed.)	by Trudy Govier	1.875/3
<i>Argument</i> (2nd ed.)	by John Gooch and Dorothy Selyer	2.33/3
<i>College Argument: Understanding the Genre</i> (1st ed.)	by Irene L. Clark	2.75/3
<i>Elements of Argument: a Text and Reader</i> (10th ed.)	by Annette T. Rottenberg and Donna Haisty Winchell	2.75/3
<i>Everything’s an Argument</i> (6th ed.)	by Andrea A. Lunsford, John J.	2.5/3

<sup>12</sup> Please see appendix section of this dissertation for a complete itemization of textbooks, as categorized according to the three-use taxonomy.

	Ruszkiewicz, and Keith Walters	
<i>Read, Reason, and Write: An Argument Text and Reader</i> (10th ed.)	by Dorothy U. Seyler	2/3
<i>They say/I say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing</i> (3rd ed)	by Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein	1.375/3
<i>Well-Crafted Argument, The</i> (5th ed.)	by Fred D. White and Simone J. Billings	2.375/3

### *Classifying and Scoring the Textbooks: Advocacy*

With tensions on the rise around the world due to a combination of contributing factors, it is no surprise that there is increased attention to the advocacy argument. The increase of technology serves as a globalized linking of communities and ideas – the new and the old, the radical and the passive, the left and the right – all vie to have their views heard in this cacophony of new voices. Because of this, I was surprised to discover that only two of the sixteen books I reviewed classified firmly as advocacy in nature (although several other books have advocacy qualities, a point of which I will discuss later in this chapter). These two textbooks, as well as the scores I allowed them, are shown below in Table 9.

*Table 9: Scores for the Advocacy Textbooks*

Title	Author	Avgd. Score
<i>Argumentation: Understanding and Shaping Arguments</i> (4th ed.)	James A. Herrick	2.75/3
<i>Purposeful Argument, The: A Practical Guide</i> (1st ed.)	Harry Phillips and Patricia Bostian	2.375/3

I find a couple things striking about these two advocacy textbooks, in addition to the fact that there are so few of them that make up my convenience sample. First is the overall high score. A score of 2 is average, and both of these textbooks are far above average, according to the criteria I set for the advocacy argument. The other striking observation is that both of these textbooks are very clearly advocacy in nature. This is not the case with the books in my other two categories, a point I will elaborate in the section immediately following the discussion on explorative-books results.

### *Classifying and Scoring the Textbooks: Explorative*

The category I thought would score highest when I first set out on this project, actually scored lowest, as you can see from Table 10, below. I interpret this as obvious need for much more development of explorative argument textbooks, along the lines of my three-use model.

*Table 10: Scores for the Explorative Category*

Title	Author	Avgd. Score
<i>Aims of Argument, The: A Text and Reader</i> (7th ed.)	by Timothy W. Crusius and Carolyn E. Channell	1.85/3
<i>Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument</i> (8th ed)	by Sylvan Barnet and Hugo Bedau	1/3
<i>Dialogues</i> (7th ed.)	by Gary Goshgarian, Kathleen Krueger	2.5/3
<i>From Critical Thinking to Argument: A Portable Guide</i> (4th ed.)	by Sylvan Barnet & Hugo Bedau	1.75/3
<i>Inventing Arguments</i> (3rd ed.)	by John Mauk and John Metz	2.375/3

### *The Blends*

I will admit to being somewhat disappointed to find that those books under the explorative category received the lowest scores overall. When I first began this project, I was convinced I would be most impressed with the explorative books, and least impressed with the advocacy books. This shows my internal prejudices, in that I prefer the idea of exploring, of expanding ideas, over defending, of advocating positions. And while I still do favor the argument that explores over that which advocates, when it comes down to textbooks, I admit those in my corpus ranked as a group well above and beyond the explorative as well as the academic/professional. To be slightly corny (which I don't mind if you don't), we can say, "Boy, do those books advocate for *something*!"

It is because of what I call "The Blends" subcategory that the advocacy textbooks – both of which do not contain traces of blending – rank markedly higher than do academic/professional and advocacy. "The Blends," are those textbooks that contain elements of more than one argument type, as judged during Phase One of this study, and of which are



most surely the result of the multitude of unclear models of argument that I discuss in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. I have marked points off from textbooks that do not directly fall under the category I set up for them, and this shows up in the overall results. Table 11, below, lists the textbooks that fall under blended categories; the table also provides appropriate justifications.

*Table 11: The Blends*

Title	Main Class	Sub-class	Justification for M.C.	Justification for S.C.
<i>Aims of Argument, The</i>	Explore	Academic/ Profess	This textbook is “the only one that focuses on the aims, or purposes, of argument.” // “For a number of reasons, inquiry has priority over other aims.” // “Informal argumentation is...open minded and creative”	“Making students conscious of the appeals to character, emotion, and style...” // “One cannot make a case without unconscious appeal to character, emotional commitments...”
<i>A Little Argument</i>	Academic/ Profess	Advocacy	“give you a set of rules of thumb” // “there are strategies and tactics that you can rely on...”.	“Your livelihood and your engagement with the community” depends upon communicating your ideas effectively.
<i>A Practical Study of Argument</i>	Academic/ Profess	Explore	“using argument skills after the course is over// “detailed...standardized technique”	“designed to improve critical thinking skills”
<i>Dialogues</i>	Explore	Advocacy	“create dialogue by examining different points of view with an open mind” // “explore a topic more fully”	“understanding the techniques of argument provides students with the tools...”
<i>Elements of Argument</i>	Academic/ Profess	Advocacy	“Successful arguments require a blend of ethos, logos, and pathos” // “win adherence of the audience”	“students must read critically and reflect on what others have to say”
<i>Everything's an Argument</i>	Academic/ Profess	Explore	argument is “a craft both powerful and professional” // “students in college should know how to analyze and make effective arguments”	“challenge students to explore new perspectives”
<i>Inventing Arguments</i>	Explore	Academic/ Profess	“Argument is ... an intellectual ... process.” Arguing should not be used to “stop explorations	“Academic disciplines are arenas of argument.”

			and cut people off”	
<i>Read, Reason, Write</i>	Academi c/Profess	Advocacy	“Is it logical?” // “Is it adequately developed?” //	“Does it achieve its purpose?”
<i>The Well- Crafted Argument</i>	Academi c/Profess	Advocacy	“An argument is a form of discourse in which the writer or speaker tries to persuade an audience to accept, reject, or think a certain way about a problem that cannot be solved by scientific or mathematical reasoning alone.”	“Argument is more explicitly an effort to change readers’ minds about an issue.”

### *Conclusion*

I close this penultimate third chapter by opening up space for the next and final one of this dissertation. In Chapter 4, I continue to look into this matter of disconnect and lack of clarity that I have been describing in terms of historical as well as contemporary stasis and argumentation models, as well as lack of clear instruction in today’s commonly used textbooks, especially in terms of how these issues might possibly be helped by applying my three-use model of argument onto them. This balance I am trying to achieve, that of allowing for some flexibility of definition and design as needed to account for various combinations of the rhetorical situation –which in my own definition, the rhetorical situation is a combination of (triggering issue) + (community-specific logic) + (desired telos) – is explored in-depth over the next few pages.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> This stasis-mapping formula is meant to serve as an alternate method to the Toulmin Model of argumentation.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### TRACING STASIS IN ARGUMENT FROM TRIGGERING ISSUE TO DESIRED TELOS BY SOLVING FOR FORMULA $[(TI) * (CSL) * (DT) = (LOSQ)]$

#### *Recap: A Look at Pages Past*

This dissertation's first chapter sketches the history of stasis since its original development in first-century Rome by Greek rhetorician Hermagoras of Temnos as an invention tool his students of rhetoric could use to help construct arguments. More importantly, however, Chapter One maps various definitions related to argumentation, and specifically stasis in argumentation. Definitions of argument and parts of arguments vary since, like any complex notion, defining argument is a difficult, contentious task, mainly because they are influenced by the "values and beliefs we bring to the exercise of defining the term [which influences] our choice of its meaning, and that in turn how we define it determines how we practice it" (Ramage et al 6). In other words, definitions flux due to community-specific logics. My taxonomy, which includes three definitions of argument, is meant to address the three main ideological influences on why we argue. Grouping them into three makes them manageable for my purposes, they are teachable; the three can be taught in a single semester. The thesis I lay out in Chapter One – that clarity of terms and more attention to the teaching of stasis is a worthwhile goal – concludes by introducing works by contemporary thinkers, specifically, Christian Kock, Patricia Fahnestock and Marie Secor. Fahnestock and Secor look at how scientific disciplines most often rely on questions of fact, whereas the literary disciplines tend to ask questions of quality. Kock hopes better education of how the stases works would help eliminate social tensions caused by ignorance. In Chapter One, I express hope that the work of this dissertation will further Kock's educational work by bringing stasis theories and practices more directly into the classroom. I hope to further Fahnestock and Secor's work as well, in

that my three-use taxonomy addresses and builds from their observation of how stasis is used differently according to the logics of discipline-specific audiences. In Chapter Two, I discuss various argumentation theories and practices and show how the multitude of them is the result of various and independent ideological constructions. Also in the second chapter, I group different audiences according to individual community-specific logics. I show how models of argument are developed uniquely to address the specific logics of various communities of audiences. The perhaps unnecessarily large number of argumentation models exists in response to the unique qualities of so many audience types. Chapter Two ends by offering my proposed three-use taxonomy as a compromise between a constricting single definition of argument and the confusingly unclear and overwhelming multitude of models that are currently in existence. Chapter Three and accompanying outlines the study design for my project of evaluating undergraduate composition textbooks and ranks them according to how well each is structured to teach one of these three uses, as well as reveals and analyzes the results of the textbook study.<sup>14</sup> As results from this analysis clearly indicate, there is a wide array of discrepancies between how authors and editors define and justify argumentation and how they teach it. This is no surprise, when considering the sloppily arranged terminology that I outline in the first and second chapters.

In this fourth and final chapter, I offer a formula that intends to lessen the logical gaps inherent of the syllogism, and in general, help clarify argumentation pedagogy by showing how it can be taught in terms of my three-use taxonomy. It may also reduce the importance of the (so-far) obligatory chapters on logical fallacies. Adding to the confusion is the fact that the logical fallacy (which is a strict no-no when writing arguments) and the syllogism (which is generally accepted as “and so it goes”) share similar – sometimes identical – characteristics of being fallacious in nature, because both involve jumps in logic. While it is true that some logic gaps will always be unavoidable in artistic arguments, it is possible to reduce this

---

<sup>14</sup> Chapter 3 includes partial results only. See appendixes for further details on this study.

tendency via use of a system more exact than the currently relied upon syllogism. My formula, if incorporated into future textbooks, could make discussions on fallacies and syllogism interesting historically, but perhaps no longer essential. Specifically, my system works as an analysis of the chain reaction of how arguments work from start to finish. Through it, I show my work in part by making the observation between logical fallacies, syllogisms, argument/counterargument" oversimplifications, and implicit as well as explicit lines of "stasis" questioning, specifically regarding how they reach often ideologically constructed truth-claims as to reach Telos, or resolution, or settling points. What I envision for future textbooks, then, would be that they are organized clearly according to my taxonomy. Introductory notes and chapters, then, would state exactly which of the models – academic/professional, advocacy, and/or exploration – the book is modeled after, philosophically speaking, and all lessons would explicitly follow the inherent logic(s).

Chapters One and Four link in respect by demonstrating that unclear, messy terms and concepts lead to confusion result in inadequate, underdeveloped theories and practices. To put Chapters Two and Four into conversation, I borrow from several of the currently existing argumentation models identified in the second chapter, and, below, offer suggestions how textbooks could clarify both terms and the logics of arguments. In part, I consult the guidelines as shown in Chapter Three's tables regarding the features of each type of argument that makes up my taxonomy of three. Also in this final chapter, I consider ways of going beyond the currently existing general stasis categories based on determiners such as "definition" and "degree" which are somewhat arbitrary because 1) they are subject to interpretation; 2) they have so far been conceived mainly for legal proceedings, which overlooks the varied many other uses of argument that could also be examined more critically via use of stasis. But the biggest change I suggest for future textbooks is the addition of  $[(ti) \times (csl) \times (dt) = (losq)]$ , which is a formula I created for mapping stasis lines in arguments.

It is worth noting the rationale for including the stasis-mapping formula in this final chapter, although it was not mentioned previously and, at first glance, might seem tangentially related to other content included in this dissertation. This stasis-mapping formula is similar to the idea of my three-use taxonomy: to provide clearer methods for creating new and analyzing existing, arguments. While the three-use taxonomy I offer specifically for classroom use – three models that can be effectively, efficiently incorporated into a single textbook and a single semester – the stasis mapping formula is more versatile as it can be used for type of argument. It can be used alongside (or even replace) the Toulmin Model,<sup>15</sup> specifically because my mapping formula takes community-specific logic into account, which the Toulmin Model does not.

#### *Reiteration: Why Stasis?*

In the field of rhetoric, the goal of winning is often motivated by legal or political concerns in which the object of the game is to get a law passed, to get one party over another elected for a position of authority, to prove the innocence or guilt of a person on trial, to advocate for or against concerns including but not limited to social, environmental, religious, or personal issues, or even to simply “argue” that we do not yet have enough information to end a line of stasis questioning. So how do we best update our textbooks as to teach students how to use stasis questioning techniques to create proofs that will help us win our argument? How can tomorrow’s teaching materials be written as to match purpose to proofs through stasis, thereby directing the line toward this “knotting” this winning of argument which is rhetor’s goal? This

---

<sup>15</sup> The Toulmin Model of argument consists of the following parts:

- (a) Claim: the position or claim being argued for; the conclusion of the argument.
- (b) Grounds: reasons or supporting evidence that bolster the claim.
- (c) Warrant: the principle, provision or chain of reasoning that connects the grounds/reason to the claim.
- (d) Backing: support, justification, reasons to back up the warrant.
- (e) Rebuttal/Reservation: exceptions to the claim; description and rebuttal of counter-examples and counter-arguments.
- (f) Qualification: specification of limits to claim, warrant and backing. The degree of conditionality asserted.

would have to be developed according to *topoi*, as Aristotle pointed out. How do we best use stasis questioning techniques to create proofs that will help us win our argument? How do we match purpose to proofs through stasis as to direct the line toward this “knotting” this winning of argument which is rhetor’s goal? This would have to be developed according to *topoi*, as Aristotle pointed out.

At the same time, hyperbolic extremism is a commonplace in Western thinking. We are taught to “address counterargument” e.g., consider “the other side” of the issue, as if there were only two extreme opposites. Most of the books I reviewed for this study give lip service to the importance of addressing counterargument, but often do not provide explicit instruction on how to do so. The stasis “line of questioning” in such cases has been underdeveloped; a more rigorous interrogation would consider arguments in their full complexity, realizing that the idea of merely “two sides” of any issue is a radical oversimplification. Antoine Braet, for instance, says that the new rhetoricians have ignored the crucial role of stasis, which makes rhetoric firmly dialogical, its goal not the imposition of one position on an audience but a critical discussion among the participants (Carter, Michael. “Stasis and kairos: Principles of social construction in classical rhetoric.” 90-91). John T. Gage also finds that stasis, which “embodied the dialectical intentions” of rhetoric, is conspicuously absent in modern inventional theories: “Instead of an act of persuasion in a manipulative sense, rhetoric [with stasis] becomes the model for exploring the possibility of assent in the symbolic exchange of what one knows in the context of what others know” (Carter 97, 98). Thoughtful, critical development of stasis lines via a systematic ordering of questions could be useful in preventing or rectifying all kinds of faulty commonplaces resulting from weak questioning, faults that can leave to any number of societal and personal conflicts. In part, this is exactly because argument/counterargument forgets these are but two extreme opposites and these only represent two reference points, often leaving much in the middle still to explore, thus necessitating increased attention to development of stases theories and applications.

*The Syllogism, Its Fallacies, and the Logics of Specific Communities*

It is no surprise that almost every undergraduate argumentation textbook available on the market today shows a heavy reliance on the syllogism. The syllogism has been an important part of argumentation instruction for thousands of years, in fact. Of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* describing rhetoric and argumentation in fifth- and fourth-Century Greece, Christopher W. Tindale notes that Aristotle advanced the syllogism as a structure of necessity, whereby "some things are assumed and something other than what is assumed follows from them" (Tindale 33). This account of limited knowledge lends support in that logic is never without bias. Numerous immature, even erroneous, conclusions are reached because of this fact, while at the same time we understand the reliance on syllogisms to be unavoidable in inartistic arguments. Syllogisms are enthymemes are from probabilities and signs. Syllogisms often result in fallacious arguments as we do not always ask enough correct questions leading to fallacy logic. For example, one syllogism is "his face is flushed he must be sick." But it could also be true that his face is flushed because he just ran a marathon. The systematic, exhaustive questioning characteristic of stasis application is meant to avoid creating syllogisms that are fallacious as a result of underdeveloped critical questions of the "gray areas" e.g. the leaps in logic, from premise to conclusion. Stasis lines of questions help clarify the syllogism, therefore lessening the appearance of gaps, jumps in logic, and other inconsistencies.

A small return to history might help clarify the relation between stasis and the syllogism. The Greek rhetorician Hermagoras of Temnos developed stasis as a system in response to the problem of Aristotle's syllogisms, in that they were difficult to apply with systematic, efficient precision. The *syllogism* is still understood today as it has been since Aristotle first wrote about it in *Rhetoric*, it is a syllogism or other argument in which a premise or the conclusion is unexpressed. It is this unexpressed area, this space-between claim and



conclusion, must be critically interrogated as to result in well-reasoned conclusion. Syllogisms are inherently inexact, since, in the absence of certainty (this uncertainty making the issue an argument in the first place; otherwise it would be an established fact rather than an argument) we have only assumptions left to work with; the syllogism is an unstable subject since it “is an argument from premises that are *probable* principles” (Murphy 63) (emphasis mine).

Rhetorical scholars James J. Murphy and Richard A. Katula go further still by criticizing the very logic of Aristotle’s artificial division between syllogisms and logical fallacies, since many syllogisms can be construed as logical fallacies and some logical fallacies are actually syllogisms. Even the attempt to logically order this system by listing syllogisms as belonging to two categories of *topoi* – common, which proceed from basic assumptions common to all subjects versus the special topics, which were drawn from basic principles in any specialized field.

Remember this syllogism from Chapter One? Here it is again (as it does tend to show up frequently in various conversations regarding the structure of argumentation):

All men are mortal (major premise – assumed)

Socrates is a man (minor premise – stated)

Therefore, Socrates is mortal. (conclusion – stated)

But this is an oversimplification. To do argumentation pedagogy proper service, it is necessary to problematize the syllogism. For example, consider this one: xxx

The body of a Sasquatch has never been found. (major premise – stated)

The known discovery of a Sasquatch’s corpse would prove the existence of  
this animal. (minor premise – assumed)

Therefore, there are no such things as Sasquatch. (conclusion stated)

Regarding the question of whether there are, or are not, Sasquatch, the above syllogism does not actually prove that Bigfoots do not exist, largely because it does not account for other

evidences beside a body, such as the multiple sightings by credible witnesses, photographic and video-recorded evidences, and that hairs have been found in places where Sasquatch are said to live that cannot be identified as those which belong to any other animal. So, to answer whether this is Bigfoot requires much more investigation. This is but one of many examples of syllogisms that over-rely on Occam's Law—the easier explanation is most likely it. Occam's Law insists that all of those reliable witnesses saw a bear, not a Sasquatch. This is an attempt to prematurely close the line of inquiry, to limit the development of this line of stasis.

### *The Influence of Community-Specific Logics on Syllogisms*

We can put the issue of syllogisms in conversation with those community-specific logics which account for the various discrepancies observable throughout all levels of argumentation theories, practices, and pedagogies, specifically in terms that the syllogism of argument works with a stress on the *probable*. Regarding audience communities, James J. Murphy observes that arguments tend to unreflexively transfer from one particular to another, as the assumption works from the premise that “if a statement is true about one group of persons or events it will be true of another that falls within the same general class” (Murphy 63). Often, philosophies that drive the ethics, laws, and teachings of advanced civilizations so their citizens coexist in (at least somewhat) civility are continually reproduced, lacking the critical examination to adequately either justify the continued existence of practice/concept, or instead be modified or replaced to accommodate for new needs or to account for new developments of theory and ideology.

But this does not give a good model to use for teaching, and our textbooks clearly discrepancies are clear indicators of this. In fact, the syllogism is at times derived from nothing more than guess work, guess work that is often built off of earlier guess work that solidified

into a *commonplace*, a truism accepted within a group of people.<sup>16</sup> The problem of syllogism is the assumption necessary in these jumps of logic when we work “from the premise that if a statement is true about one group of persons or events it will be true of another that falls within the same general class” (Murphy 63). But the assumption is erroneous that what is true in one case is directly transferable to other, similar cases.

Argumentation textbooks need to make explicit which ideologies they follow. This is important because we need clear structures to think, and Ideological thinking indeed “orders facts into an absolutely logical procedure which starts from an axiomatically accepted premise, deducing everything else from it; that is, it proceeds with a consistency that exists nowhere in the realm of reality” (Bolduc, Frank 311), and having definable audiences creates a sense of context that fosters rehearsal of inner speech arguments. Ward (2009) noted that “audience provides context, which provides motivation, which stimulates inner speech, which stimulates writing development, which motivates contextualization” (Qtd. Andriessen 69). Further attention to pedagogical development of stasis theory/lines of questioning begins by noting the observation that different mindsets, different disciplines, different ideologies often get in the way of further exploring still-to-be-answered questions because the stasis lines tend to be unquestioned since the logic of a “truth” is often unconsciously accepted within specific ideological groupings. We develop ideologies that lead to how we argue and accept what counts as valid argument, and at the base of this are the differing questions that help one reach a status point – all driven by development of various questions that may or may not actually help answer the original question in any way that is more explorative than culture-bound acceptances of “truth.” What is overlooked here is that stases are not necessarily Truths but merely points of static we might sit upon when we just need to rest a moment.

Not since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century have serious attempts been made to teach argumentation as a rigid formal logic, due to the syllogism issue. And while we cannot rely on

---

<sup>16</sup> A commonplace is not comprised of a string of facts that build off one another, but of probabilities built off probabilities.

formal logic as a fool-proof method of argumentation, we do need ordering systems. I add to the growing number of voices who suggest that more systemization could add both thoughtfulness and clarity to argumentation studies and practices. In addition to Kock, Fahnestock, and Secor, we can look at the works of Jeffrey Carroll, who is a contemporary scholar working with stasis in a non-traditional way by using it when teaching argumentation. He sees working with stasis theory as a method that “focuses learners on acts and agents, and draws work that might seem like floundering with abstraction into productive, hard illustration” (Carroll 161). This has to do with definable audiences as well, since definable audiences create a sense of context that fosters rehearsal of inner speech arguments. Ward (2009) noted, “audience provides context, which provides motivation, which stimulates inner speech, which stimulates writing development, which motivates contextualization” (69)

I do not propose a system of formal logic, satisfied with symbols that are not subjected to interpretation so that in demonstration, even if we go beyond the purely formal domain, we rely as much as possible on fixed objects, whether they are abstract or concrete. (Bolduc Frank 328). Instead, the textbooks I envision for the future do not rely on formal logic, but borrow from it as a way of ordering and concretizing the structure of arguments. We can think of it in terms of the early twentieth-century debate coach, that “(s)uccess in life is largely a matter of reducing every situation to a definite, clear-cut proposition, analyzing that proposition or picking out the main points at issue, and then directing one’s efforts to the solution of the problem thus revealed” (Ketcham 7, 8). Or, as it has been said similarly to what I would call a form of forcing points of stasis by compartmentalizing and conquering:

Whether in sports, politics, business, or love, there are rules. Adhering to them raises not only the level of efficiency but the level of enjoyment as well. This applies equally to arguments. .... Knowing the rules of argument, and abiding by them in practice, hopefully achieves this goal (Eisenberg, Ilardo 23).

Consider the importance of definable practices in terms of Kock's work, specifically, in relation to his example on the stasis category of definition, of how life is defined. What seems to be an argument over abortion is actually, at the most basic level, the argument is about human life and the rights of a living human. It is generally decided that it's unfair to kill another human being just because you can, just because it's in your way. The contentious argument has not paid enough attention to this point, though, as they tend to speak in broad strokes, whether or not abortion should be allowed. We skipped over steps; we had not developed the questions appropriate for us to come to any decision as to the definition of life – whether it begins at conception, at birth, at six weeks, or at any point in between. How is it, exactly, that we define/categorize someone as "alive"? If a heartbeat can be detected? If evidence of brain wave activity can be traced? If the fetus can live independently, outside the womb?

#### *Moving Stasis from Categories-Of to Lines-Of*

For future textbooks, I propose we expand stasis as a concept to the current four-category system by introducing a formula that works by constructing the progression of a specific argument's triggering issue, what logic this specific community of arguers is willing to accept, and finally the desired telos. Stasis lines are sequentially driven series of question that begin at triggering issue and can reach an arguer's desired resolution depending upon how well they anticipate points of challenge and uncertainty depends upon how well they serve to provide the proof and win the argument. My stasis-line mapping formula teases out the concept of *demonstration* as laid out by Michelle K. Bolduc and David A Frank, that demonstration is reserved for the means of proof permitting us to come to a conclusion by moving from the truth of certain propositions to that of other propositions and, in the field of formal logic, by moving from certain theses of a system to other theses of the same system with the aid of defined rules of transformation. (Bolduc, Frank 315). To map a line of stasis is to draw a link

between the empty spaces in syllogisms, which would at least cut down on logical fallacies that would weaken proofs, thereby making it more difficult to construct successful arguments. Stasis lines are comprised of questions that progress sequentially from start to finish and, depending upon how well they anticipate points of challenge and uncertainty, determine how well they serve to provide the proof and win the argument. Holes, gaps, and wrong turns do not make clear/good lines of stasis.

Back to the importance of incorporating clear definitions as a start to developing clearer, more effective pedagogical tools (in this case, the undergraduate argumentation textbook). The key concept of this formula is what I call a “stasis line,” which I define as the series of questions that move an argument from triggering issue to resolution. This systematic, exhaustive questioning characteristic of stasis application is meant to avoid creating syllogisms that are fallacious as a result of underdeveloped critical questions of the “gray area” from premise to conclusion. The syllogism is the predecessor of my stasis line, my stasis line seeks to explore the gaps, or logical leaps, between premise and conclusion. A line of stasis, comprised of a clear sequence of questions that drive an argument from triggering issue to resolution, is meant to add structure and clarity to the gaps left behind by the syllogism. The stasis lines are analyzed according to what logic would best achieve create nonfallacious syllogisms as to achieve the argument “win” as determined by the goals as outlined by context-specific guidelines. We do not “measure length” of stasis but its development includes not just length but also how thoughtful observant and thorough in treatment, clear “lines” developed for this specific situation. This is linked to stasis theory—the questions drive the eventual point of static, where we rest on a truth (“a” and lower-case ‘t’ intended). But a more perfect and complete development of stasis theories/questions specific to each topoi, could go far to help clarify the issue and in this way hopefully getting clearer resolutions.

In addition to formatting future textbooks along the lines of my three-use taxonomy, I recommend explicit attention be paid to stasis lines, which I define as sequentially driven

series of questions that begin at the triggering issue and can reach an arguer's desired resolution depending upon how well they anticipate points of challenge and uncertainty depends upon how well they serve to provide the proof and win the argument. To map a line of stasis is to draw a link between the empty spaces in syllogisms, which would at least cut down on logical fallacies that would weaken proofs, thereby making it more difficult to construct successful arguments. Stasis lines are comprised of questions that progress sequentially from start to finish and, depending upon how well they anticipate points of challenge and uncertainty, determine how well they serve to provide the proof and win the argument. Holes, gaps, and wrong turns do not make clear/good lines of stasis.

*Introducing Formula [(TI) X (CSL) X (DT) = (LOSQ)]*

What I propose for future textbooks is the inclusion of my stasis-mapping formula. The relationship between stasis and use-specific teloi can help to understand how different theories and uses of argument (mostly implicitly) employ sequences of questions (stasis lines e.g.) to reach particular goals, goals that vary from models concerned with cognition (as internal faculty versus as social/community driven), or with correctness (this is the "right" thing to do as far as form, or ethics, or inquiry) or with orientation (sender versus receiver, e.g.), and so on, via this formula as template:

$$[(ti) * (csl) * (dt)] = [(los)]$$

This is an abbreviation of: [(triggering issue) \* (community-specific "logic") \* (desired Telos)] = [(line of stasis "questions")] This formula can serve as a template both for diagramming existing, as well as for inventing new, arguments in any situation. What content fills the brackets and parentheses will differ according to specific needs, opportunities, and constraints of an actor or actors engaged in an argument.

Relating to my advocacy model of argumentation, we can take the example of this incomplete argument to see how the mapping formula could help flesh out the details: "White

people blues is by far the worst thing ever invented to pass as music. Proof there is no god and proof there is a devil.” The triggering issue is obvious here; it is a debate over whether white people blues have value as a form of music. The desired telos is also strongly implied if not stated directly, that the arguer wishes to convince his audience that white people blues have no value as a form of music. We do not know the community-specific logic nor the line of stasis questioning that forefront this claim, however. Mapped as is, this argument would look at least half empty, like this:

[(Do white people blues have value as a form of music?) X (????) X (I want to prove that white people blues have no value) = (????)]

Compare the weak stasis line in this underdeveloped argument with examples provided using the three uses of argument that make up my taxonomy. By treating these uses as three broad categories of topoi, I hope to contribute to argumentation theory and practice, in part by defining how stasis and warrants might best be examined and reproduced within the individual logic of each of these terms.

E.g., as in a workplace argument, of which would fall under the academic/professional model in my taxonomy and therefore could be used as an example in future editions of textbooks such as Clark’s *College Argument: Understanding the Genre* and/or Gooch and Seyler’s *Argument*, and/or Faigley and Selzer’s *A Little Argument*, and/or Govier’s *A Practical Study of Argument*, and/or Graff, Birkenstein, and Durst’s *They Say/I Say*, and/or Seyler’s *Read, Reason, Write: An Argument Text and Reader*, and/or Lunsford, Ruskiewics and Walters’s *Everything’s an Argument*, and/or White and Billings’s *The Well Crafted Argument*, and/or Rottenberg and Haisty-Winchell’s *Elements of Argument*:



[(murder trial) \* (applicable murder statute) \* (“guilty” verdict for prosecutor)] =  
 [(How can proof of murder be established beyond reasonable doubt?) x (How can judge and  
 jury be convinced the killing was an unlawful, deliberate act?) x (How can defendant’s  
 culpability, e.g., sanity, knowledge of right from wrong, be proven?)]

And here is another advocacy argument that could be used as an example in  
 tomorrow’s textbooks (such as future editions of Herrick’s *Argumentation: Understanding  
 and Shaping Arguments* and/or Phillops and Bostian’s *The Purposeful Argument*):

[(pedagogical objectives must include writing to improve social conditions) \* (well-  
 developed curriculum can both improve students’ writing skills and encourage them to give  
 voice on issues they care about) \* (increase writing skills and develop in students enhanced  
 sense of civic responsibility)] = [(How can I clearly articulate my objectives?) \*? (What  
 lessons will best adhere to my objectives?) \* (How will I evaluate student progress in reaching  
 course objectives?)]

Or as in an explorative argument (perhaps in future editions of Goshgarian and  
 Krueger’s *Dialogues*, and/or in Crusius and Channell’s *The Aims of Argument*, and/or in Mauk  
 and Metz’s *Inventing Arguments*, and/or in one or both of Barnet and Bedau’s books, *Critical  
 Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument*, and *From Critical Thinking to  
 Argument*):

[(personal musings on topic of stealing) \* (knowledge is the result of internal  
 argument) \* (understand “stealing” in all its complex forms)] = [(How can stealing be defined  
 and described?) \* (What is the history of the subject?) \* (What system, or systems, is this topic  
 a part of?)]

While I envision use of my formula in combination with my three-use taxonomy, certainly it is flexible enough that it can be applied to unlimited models of argumentation. Let us borrow from Chapter Two, two of the six subcategories<sup>17</sup> of Philippe Besnard and Anthony Hunter’s model of the monological argument. Besnard and Hunter define a factual argument as one that uses only objective information with the aim of informing the audience about some verifiable information, e.g. a scientific review. The factual argument can be diagrammed according to Table 12 shown below:

*Table 12: A Factual Argument as Mapped through the Stasis Formula*

<b>Triggering issue</b>	<b>Community-specific logic</b>	<b>Desired telos</b>	<b>Stasis line</b>
Need to disseminate factual data.	Objective information only!	To disseminate verifiable information, e.g., scientific review, news article.	Why does this information need dissemination? Who is our audience? How does the audience shape the style, tone, and content of message? How should/can this message be delivered?

Mapped through the stasis-line formula, the Table 1 looks like this:

[(Need to disseminate factual data.) \* (Objective information only!) \*

(To disseminate verifiable information, e.g., scientific review, news article.) = (Why does this information need dissemination? → Who is our audience? → How does the audience shape the style, tone, and content of message? → How should/can this message be delivered?)]

---

<sup>17</sup> These six subcategories consist of the factual, the positional, the persuasional, the prevocational, the speculative, the auto-argumental, and the “one-to-many” (Besnard Hunter 10).

A positional argument, as defined by Besnard and Hunter, uses objective, subjective, and hypothetical information with the aim of informing the audience of the presenter’s belief, e.g. an opinion article.

*Table 13: A Positional Argument as Mapped Via Stasis Formula*

<b>Triggering issue</b>	<b>Community-specific logic</b>	<b>Desired telos</b>	<b>Stasis line</b>
Need to state one’s point of view.	Objective, subjective, and hypothetical information is all fair game.	To present one’s belief, e.g., opinion article, persuasive essay.	What do I know about this topic? What, exactly <i>is</i> my position? Is my knowledge sufficient to justify my stance? Why should others know my opinion on the topic? Who is my audience? How should I structure my message rhetorically (e.g., appeals, stylistics, content)? What delivery method would be most effective?

Mapped through the formula, the above table takes on this appearance:

[(Need to state one’s point of view.) \* (Objective, subjective, and hypothetical information is all fair game.) \* (To present one’s belief, e.g., opinion article, persuasive essay.) = (What do I know about this topic? → What, exactly *is* my position? → Is my knowledge sufficient to justify my stance? → Why should others know my opinion on the topic? → Who is my audience? → How should I structure my message rhetorically (e.g., appeals, stylistics, content)? → What delivery method would be most effective?)]

Here is one final example. I briefly discussed the work of Patricia Roberts-Miller in Chapter Two. I would like to now return to Roberts-Miller’s work, and in this case focus specifically on the criticism she made that, in some textbook introductions, the authors make the claim that argumentation is important to assure a healthy democracy, these same books fail to make clear which model of democracy they imagine”, an oversight possibly resulting from “very little (if any)” awareness that different models exist. In effort to help meet the goal of developing

books that are consistent with the goals of the six public sphere types she identifies, we can apply use the stasis formula according to six ways, to account for the specific logic of each.<sup>18</sup>

Roberts-Miller believes that:

{[(clearer instruction) = (the teaching of strategies, tactics, schema)] = [csl]} could be used to address the [(underdeveloped public sphere models in textbooks) = (ti)] to achieve [(better developed classroom instruction on public spheres) = (dt)]

We can use our template to diagram her concerns as follows:

[(lack of clarity in textbooks) \* (logic as specific to each of these six models) \* (textbooks containing clear democracy models)] = [(How can I familiarize textbook authors with these models?) (How can I convince authors and publishers of the need for increased clarity?) (How can these “new and improved” textbooks reach wide dissemination?)]

### *Conclusion*

Admittedly, this study is not designed perfectly; it is as flawed and as useful as is possible, considering the limitations of time, resources, and forethought. The idea that textbooks might hope to be relieved of their duty of reproducing that mandatory chapter on logical fallacies is far-reaching, if for no other reason than textbook publishers and buyers are expected to reproduce what has always worked in the past. A bigger issue is that my formula does not *eliminate* the usefulness of other textbooks and other ways of teaching argumentation, generally so. At best, my formula might offer some new solutions. This study is problematic as well because of the fact I judged each textbook in terms of my three-use taxonomy, a taxonomy which has not yet been properly introduced to the field of argumentation pedagogy, therefore giving book authors and editors an unfair disadvantage as far as my ranking scale.

---

<sup>18</sup> The six types identified by Roberts –Miller are: Liberal, Technocracy, Interest-based, Agonistic, Communitarian, and Deliberative. Please see Chapter 2 for an explanation of these terms.

Still, there is value in the work outlined in this dissertation. The appendixes alone offer rich and unexplored territory that we might hope to investigate further in the near future. Also, not all arguments are of the black-and-white clarity of courtroom proceedings in which a convicted person can only be convicted of guilt, or of innocence, depending upon how the judge and jurors weigh the evidence provided in relation to the case. But even within such a seemingly orderly system, arguments arise as to the interpretation of applicable laws, as to the credibility of evidences and witnesses. Of course, a decision has to be made since we cannot leave cases open indefinitely. Often, to come to a “ruling” a point of stasis that is often forced as this is seen as necessary as court needs to be efficient move on with this case and to address others. But the problem here is in the dumping off and moving on, the job, the dull rubber conveyer belt trudging its circular pattern. We move onto next case as needed for our own jobs for efficiency, for money, for time to move on to next case, no more time to look at this one. In matters when time case stasis is achieved not because in true faith that this is “Truth” but it is enough lower-case “truth” for us to feel okay in line with our common business sense, efficiency, which trump advocacy (the “what’s in it for me?” is missing. ) and exploration (interesting but takes too long and there is no profit foreseeable in it.)

A strong argument in favor of extending lines of stasis questioning is that to come to any decision requires the party or parties involved in an argument to stop or freeze motion; motion stopped prematurely imposes a false stasis upon a kinetic phenomenon. I hope the work of this dissertation project achieves my goal of helping to build praxis in the field by offering a new taxonomy of argument, an evaluation of popular contemporary argumentation textbooks according to this taxonomy, as well as a formula for creating new and analyzing existing arguments.

## APPENDIX ONE

### Existing Argumentation Theories as Categorized According to Three-Use Taxonomy

author/title of work	author's term	author's definition	1) acad/ profess 2) advoc 3) explor	my justification/explanation
Keats, John (in publication by Bate, Walter Jackson.) <i>Negative Capability</i>	Negative Capability	That ability for humans to be capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, and doubts, without feeling the need to reach out after fact and reason (Bate 16, 17). In a letter to his brother George, he wrote that the “only means of strengthening one’s intellect is to make up one’s mind about nothing—to let the mind be a thoroughfare for all thoughts” (18).	3	Because it’s about the mind as a thoroughfare for thoughts. Note: While this isn’t directly an *argument* term as defined by author, I included in the explorative category because the concept in itself encapsulates the idea I have for the explorative subcategory of my three-use taxonomy.
Bentahar, Jamal, Bernard Moulin, Micheline Belanger. “A taxonomy of argumentation models used for knowledge representation.”	persuasion	Is centered on conflicting points of view.	1	key word “centered” seems to focus on mechanical structure,
	negotiation	In which participants aim to achieve a settlement that is particularly advantageous for individual parties.	2	The “particularly advantageous” part sounds like advocacy issues might be at stake.
	inquiry	Which is the aim is to collectively discover more information, as well as to destroy incorrect information.	3	Again, this is about the seeking of knowledge.
	deliberation	Which is driven by the need to make a collective decision.	2	Deliberation takes place when two or more parties advocate for opposing (or in some way dissimilar) outcomes, but choose to compromise rather than risk all-stakes eristic battle.

	information-seeking	one party asks for information known by another	3	The seeking of knowledge, of information.
	eristic	two parties combat each other in a quarrels	2	See “deliberation”. The difference here is the engagement in winner-takes-all strategy.
Besnard, Philippe and Anthony Hunter. <i>Elements of Argumentation.</i>	monologic	an internal process for an agent (an autonomous, proactive, intelligent system that has some role, e.g., lawyers, journalists, complex software systems) or an entity (a set of agents that in concert have some role, e.g. board of directors for a company) with perhaps a tangible output (e.g., an article or a speech or a decision).” This is a static form of argumentation, as it “captures the net result of collating and analyzing some conflicting information” (10);	3	The attention to process in this definition
	dialogic	set of entities or agents who interact to construct arguments for or against a particular claim. Arguments can be disputed. Emphasis is on the nature of interactions on process of building up the set of arguments until the agents collectively reach a conclusion.	2	The attention to “for or against” and “agents collectively reach a conclusion” suggest advocating for, or against, certain topics/issues.
Billig, Michael. <i>Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology.</i>	sophistic rhetoric	In matters of the early Greek courtrooms, “there was an obvious need for professional speech writers, who would know how to present the strong points of a case and to	1	Well, “professional” and the attention to building mechanical structures of arguments.

		counter the arguments of opponents” (Billig 35)		
Walton and Krabbe (quoted Bentahar, Moulin, Belanger 2010).	persuasion	conflict of opinions, use is to persuade other party as to resolve or clarify issue.	1	The focus on persuasion suggests attention to formal/mechanical structure, how to physically construct argument as to be most persuasive.
	inquiry	need for proof, to find and verify evidence as to prove or disprove a hypothesis	3	It’s all about the search, here.
	discovery	need to find an explanation of facts, to find and defend a suitable hypothesis as to choose the best hypothesis for testing	3	The emphasis here is on the search, on exploring the root of an issue or cause.
	negotiation	conflict of interests, to find a reasonable settlement that both (or all) parties involved can live with.	2	This is interest-based, strongly suggesting advocacy in nature.
	information-seeking	need to acquire or give information.	3	Again, the attention is on the seeking of information, e.g., exploration.
	deliberation	the task of solving a dilemma or practical choice by coordinating goals and action as to decide the best available course of action.	1	While this definition could logically fall under the category of 2 because of the suggestion that there are advocates on either (or various) sides of the dilemma, I place it under 1 because the focus is on the “task of solving” suggesting there would be attention to the mechanical structure of the argument(s), looking at the argument of and in itself, places it more so under my definition of the academic/professional category.
	eristic	Generally stemming from personal conflict, the <i>eristic</i> aims to win	2	Eristic arguments take place when two or more parties advocate for



		an argument against an opponent		opposing (or in some way dissimilar) outcomes, and choose to engage in risky, winner-takes-all eristic battle.
--	--	---------------------------------	--	--

## APPENDIX TWO

### Phase One: Classifying Academic/Professional Textbooks According to Three-Use Taxonomy

Category: Academic/ Professional (Writing as Product, as Search for Employment)		
Identifying Markers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•“conventional academic writing skills”</li> <li>•employ multimedia</li> <li>•rhetorical tradition</li> <li>•concern with technical structure, how to best build argument for audience (opposed to advocacy, main focus is topic &amp; explorative, largely inner directed</li> <li>•genre /students need to compose in forms beyond the essay</li> <li>•writing as good application to future coursework</li> <li>•colleges and workplaces demand...</li> <li>•attention to physical develop e.g., “how is the thesis developed and supported?”</li> <li>•Toulmin: “An argument consist of evidence and/or reasons presented n support of an assertion or claim that is either stated or implied”</li> <li>•“academic discourse”</li> <li>•rhetorical situation</li> <li>•writing is a function</li> <li>•academic discourse</li> <li>•workplace university and other careers</li> <li>•“elements” = basic, microscopic elements, analytical</li> <li>•Toulmin, claim reason, support</li> <li>•successful arguments have blend logos, ethos, pathos</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•goal is to win adherence of audience</li> <li>•Teaching the formal “types” e.g., Aristotilian, Rogerian, Toulmin</li> <li>•attention to physical process “steps for writing argument texts”</li> <li>•“students in college should know...arguments”</li> <li>•finding, analyzing, incorporating sources</li> <li>•working with new technologies</li> <li>•academic writing = admission to college</li> <li>•clear, methodological approaches favored</li> <li>•use sources to advance arguments</li> <li>•purposeful use of language and images</li> <li>•audience, especially attention to how message is created/ certain words and phrases produce predictable responses (e.g., rhetorical situation)</li> <li>•college/campus life/issues that engage the academic community/ writing arguments in college</li> <li>•faculty in classroom and research programs</li> <li>•strategies and tactics for effective arguments</li> <li>•multimodal approaches</li> <li>•“well crafted argument” craft = form</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•formal definitions of argument / argument is a claim supported by reason</li> <li>•it is your job to explain why your readers should consider it important</li> <li>•students enrolled in courses</li> <li>•students get feedback</li> <li>•find conclusions and premises</li> <li>•standardizing technique</li> <li>•reasoned criticism</li> <li>•of practical value</li> <li>•logic and reasoning of central importance</li> <li>•structure</li> <li>•usefulness</li> <li>•argument models bridge gap between understanding logical structure and how argument actually written</li> <li>•induction</li> <li>•induction, deduction, analogy, logical fallacies</li> <li>•employers</li> <li>•skill development</li> <li>•college and workplace</li> <li>•time-tested techniques</li> <li>•commonly taught topics</li> <li>•effective classroom text</li> <li>•grounded in scholarship</li> <li>•convincing evidence</li> <li>•pattern of reasoning</li> <li>•logical progression from thesis to support of thesis to conclusion/process driven e.g., “follow these steps to ... [refute a claim, e.g.] “process of composing argument”</li> </ul>
Textbooks Classified Accordingly		
1. <i>A Little Argument</i> (2nd ed.) Lester	6. <i>Everything’s an Argument</i> (6th ed.) by	

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Faigley &amp; Jack Selzer</p> <p>2. <i>A Practical Study of Argument</i> (7th ed.) by Trudy Govier</p> <p>3. <i>Argument</i> (2nd ed.) by John Gooch and Dorothy Selyer</p> <p>4. <i>College Argument: Understanding the Genre</i> (1st ed.) by Irene L. Clark</p> <p>5. <i>Elements of Argument: a Text and Reader</i> (10th ed.) by Annette T. Rottenberg and Donna Haisty Winchell</p> | <p>Andrea A. Lunsford, John J. Ruszkiewicz, and Keith Walters</p> <p>7. <i>Read, Reason, and Write: An Argument Text and Reader</i> (10th ed.) by Dorothy U. Seyler</p> <p>8. <i>They say/I say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing</i> (3rd ed.) by Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein</p> <p>9. <i>Well-Crafted Argument, The</i> (5th ed.) by Fred D. White and Simone J. Billings</p> |
|--|--|

## APPENDIX THREE

### Phase One: Classifying Advocacy Textbooks According to Three-Use Taxonomy

Category: Advocacy (writing as consequence, as search for “good”)		
Identifying Markers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•argumentation is “essential for maintaining a democracy” (Maouk Metz xxviii)</li> <li>•argument to “defend against government and corporate propaganda” (MM xxix)</li> <li>•students need help “inventing unique positions” (Mauk Metz xix)</li> <li>•students have to argue for themselves and others, for the world they want to inhabit; if you don’t make arguments others will for you and will define how you live and hope</li> <li>•argument skills are to be carried over into civic and life issues beyond college</li> <li>•sources help advance arguments about important issues (Greene Lidinski iii)</li> <li>•Definition of argument: “text crafted to persuade an audience” (Greene Lidinski)</li> <li>• question how the world works and how it can be changed (GL 4)</li> <li>• convey empathy while presenting your own point of view (GL 9)</li> <li>• activities include only the two opposites “pro/con” their side/our side (GL 11)</li> <li>• citizenship</li> <li>•stronger more focused arguments</li> <li>•argument also includes clashing with power</li> <li>•argue in response to issue’</li> <li>•invention strategies include</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•argument function order of importance: 1) justify, 2_) persuade, 3_ discover (Herrick 5)</li> <li>•concern with values (Herrick 5)</li> <li>•ethically grounded</li> <li>•nurture values central to democratic discourse</li> <li>•public and private settings</li> <li>•citizens to present their viewpoints</li> <li>•pertinent to student concerns</li> <li>•advocate</li> <li>•personal values</li> <li>•public discourse</li> <li>•moral responsibilities</li> <li>•advocacy ethics</li> <li>•ethically grounded</li> <li>•good public discourse</li> <li>•Activity: “Identify the value that led you from the fact to your conclusion” (Herrick 13)</li> <li>•how do global issues touch us</li> <li>•how do we as voters and consumers have consequences in the world</li> <li>•involved citizens</li> <li>•help students advance arguments</li> <li>•concentration on readings about</li> <li>•affects us</li> <li>•advocating/advocacy</li> <li>•social and political purposes</li> <li>•argue vigorously</li> <li>•“it is your job to explain why your readers should consider [your point] important” (FS 6)</li> <li>•“The Purposeful Argument” title suggest argument has a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•argumentation defined as “the cooperative activity of developing and advancing arguments and of responding to the arguments of others” (Herrick 3). Why develop &amp; advance FIRST?</li> <li>•arguments are of subjects people care deeply about</li> <li>•public debate</li> <li>•free and pluralistic society</li> <li>•first step is “setting out our views and supporting those views with our reasons’ (Herrick 4)</li> <li>•“Let’s define power as the capacity to wield influence, to shape important decisions that affect the lives of others” (Herrick 5)</li> <li>•we want to justify our positions on issues</li> <li>•we want to persuade</li> <li>•argument skill is to prepare us to be more effective advocates (Herrick 7)</li> <li>•commitment to ethical advocacy (Herrick 12)</li> <li>• “important global issues” (Johnson xx)</li> <li>•public dialogue</li> <li>•join worldwide conversation immediacy...importance</li> <li>•hot-button public issues</li> <li>•”as a citizen”</li> <li>•moved to register your views (Faigley selzer ix)</li> <li>•strategies and tactics (FS ix)</li> <li>•current controversies</li> <li>•arguments are attempts to change other’s minds by convincing them your argument is more valid</li> </ul>

substantial attention to personal experiences and emotions” (Phillips Bostian xviii) •arguments take place in “real life”	purpose •private responsibility to argue for public good • “stake, defend, and justify your claim”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• find your place among others</li> <li>• defend one’s point of view</li> </ul>
<b>Textbooks Classified Accordingly</b>		
1. <i>Argumentation: Understanding and Shaping Arguments</i> (4th ed.) James A. Herrick	2. <i>Purposeful Argument, The: A Practical Guide</i> (1st ed.) Harry Phillips & Patricia Bostian	

## APPENDIX FOUR

### Phase One: Classifying Explorative Textbooks According to Three-Use Taxonomy

Category: Explorative (writing as discovery, search for Truth/truths)		
Identifying Markers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•interest in dialogues</li> <li>•exploration of multiple perspectives</li> <li>•examine different points of view with open mind</li> <li>•critical thinking necessary precursor to argument</li> <li>•listen to others as well as ourselves</li> <li>•open-minded</li> <li>•question one's own assumptions</li> <li>•process starts with imagination! imagination-&gt; analysis -&gt; evaluation</li> <li>•'writing as a way of thinking</li> <li>•getting ideas as focus "critical" thinking or writing</li> <li>•book is about "getting ideas"</li> <li>•multisided conversation</li> <li>•"he who knows only his own side of the cause knows little" (Barnet Bedau iv)</li> <li>•marshaling evidence and defending a thesis is misleading</li> <li>•process includes arguing with one's self</li> <li>•the four criteria of mature reasoning</li> <li>•inquiry is dialectic, is dialogue or serious conversation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•interest in ideas, invention</li> <li>•argumentation is open-ended and creative</li> <li>•purpose of learning sequences are for students to understand why they were doing what they were doing and to envision what might come next</li> <li>• "inattention" pointed out in criticism</li> <li>•criticize teaching students to understand arguments "only as monologues of advocacy" because this approach ignores inquiry.</li> <li>•"aims of argument" = where it's going not where it came from nor where it is now.</li> <li>•Relativity addressed: "what is the relative value of the four aims?"</li> <li>four aims of argument (are stasis!!!) to inquire, to convince, to persuade, to mediate. is attention to progress. places "mediate" last because it "integrates inquiry, convincing, and persuading."</li> <li>dialogue helps students think through their arguments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•engage in constructive dialogue</li> <li>•we believe in the sequence as much as the aims.</li> <li>•aims of argument linked in sequence so they build on inquiry, persuasion, on convicting, and all three contribute to mediation</li> <li>•our approach is innovative</li> <li>•range of perspectives</li> <li>•aware of why people argue</li> <li>•aware of what purposes arguments serve</li> <li>•mature reasoning</li> <li>•mature decisions are thoughtful</li> <li>•opinion plus reason (ala Toulmin, advocacy, etc) is just starting point. this is the "basic form" that must be understood as a place to begin when considering your own and other's arguments</li> <li>•place to begin</li> <li>•open-minded reasoning</li> <li>•challenge unexamined belief</li> <li>•all claims are answers to questions</li> <li>"Aims of Argument" key word "aims" suggests a moving forward.</li> </ul>
Textbooks Classified Accordingly		
1. <i>Aims of Argument, The: A Text and Reader</i> (7th ed.) Timothy W. Crusius & Carolyn E. Channell	3. <i>Dialogues</i> (7th ed.) Gary Goshgarian, Kathleen Krueger	
2. <i>Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument</i> (8th ed) Sylvan Barnet & Hugo Bedau	4. <i>From Critical Thinking to Argument: A Portable Guide</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> ed.) Sylvan Barnet & Hugo Bedau	
	5. <i>Inventing Arguments</i> (3rd ed.) John Mauk & John Metz	

## APPENDIX FIVE

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *The Aims of Argument* (7<sup>th</sup> edition) by

Timothy W. Crusius and Carolyn E. Channell

Classification: Explorative (academic/professional)	
Chapter 1, “Understanding Argument,” selected for review because it includes a section explanative of the authors’ view of “what exactly is an argument?”	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
FOLLOWING THROUGH (p. 8): Any good piece of writing can give you ideas for your own writing. The Pitts editorial calls labeling into question, and you can probably recall when someone applied a label with negative connotations to you or to some group to which you belong. Choose an instance and either accept the label and defend it as something positive or reject it and show why it should not be applied to your or your group.	1, because this insistence the student jump right into the positive or negative evaluation sounds much more like advocacy than like exploration
Chapter 2, “Reading an Argument,” selected for review because of its focus on analyzing arguments.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
FOLLOWING THROUGH (p. 16): An argument on the topic of body decoration (tattoos and piercings) appears later in this chapter. “On teenagers and tattoos” is about motives for decorating the body. As practice in identifying the climate of opinion surrounding a topic, think about what people say about tattooing. Have you heard people arguing that it is low class? A rebellion against middle-class conformity? Immoral? An artistic expression? A fad? An affront to school or parental authority? An expression of individuality? If you would not want a tattoo, why not? If you have a tattoo, why did you get it? In your writer's notebook, jot down some positions you have heard debated, and state your own viewpoint.	3, because I think this is fairly effective as a lesson on writing rhetorical analyses. There are a lot of good directions given for where the student should look (e.g. what is relationship between image and text? when/why/why was the text created?) This lesson assignment has included in the chapter with it several samples of rhetorical analyses to serve as models, too.
FOLLOWING THROUGH (p. 17): Note the following information about “On Teenagers and Tattoos.” <i>When published:</i> In 1997, reprinted fall 2000. <i>Where published:</i> In the <i>Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry</i> , published by the American Academy of child and adolescent society, then reprinted in <i>Reclaiming Children and Youth</i> . <i>Written by Whom:</i> Andres Martin, M.D. Martin is an associate Prof. of child psychiatry at the Yale Child Study Center in New Haven, CT.	2.5, because I'm not so sure the buildup here – if the concentration is supposed to be on the text itself then why all the conversation about asking about the author, etc. I do understand this is about teaching students to read sources, and there is a certain logic in this dialogic aspect here, meaning the conversation about how the author's perspective might be different than a teen's, a parent's

	or a teacher's. But this strikes me as more academic in tone rather than explorative, overall.
<p>FOLLOWING THROUGH (p. 24): find other words in Martin's essay that sound specific to the field of psychology. Use the surrounding text to come up with laypersons terms for these concepts.</p>	1.5 because this seems like a good exercise in close reading, but this particular lesson gives little clue as to how this is supposed to help students explore the concept the idea at hand, per sey.
<p>FOLLOWING THROUGH (p. 25): convert the following sentences into active voice. We have put the passive voice verbs in bold type, but you may need to look at the surrounding text to figure out who the agents are.</p> <p>A sense of constancy <i>can be derived</i> from unchanging marks that <i>can be carried</i> along no matter what the physical, temporal, or geographical visit to its at hand. (Paragraph 9.)</p> <p>To edit this one, ask <i>who</i> can derive <i>what</i> and to who can carry what.</p> <p>The intense and often disturbing reactions that <i>are mobilized</i> in viewers can help effectively keep them at Bay, becoming tantamount to the proverbial keep out sign hanging form a teenager store. (Paragraph 4.)</p> <p>To edit, ask <i>what</i> mobilizes the reactions in other people.</p>	1.25 because, while I like the very end as it gets students asking what mobilizes people which does seem explorative, this is almost wholly an exercises in grammar, not in exploration, which places this lesson firmly in the academic/professional category.
<b>Averaged score: 1.85</b>	



## APPENDIX SIX

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *A Little Argument* (2<sup>ND</sup> edition) by

Faigley and Selzer

Classification: Academic/Professional (advocacy)	
Chapter 1, “Making an Effective Argument,” selected for review because its title “Making an Effective Argument” indicates what the authors’ conception of argument is	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>(p. 10) Mapping a conversation like the debate about microcredit often can help you identify how you can add to the conversation. What can you add to what’s been said?</p> <p>Some people claim that _____</p> <p>Other people respond that _____</p> <p>Still others claim that _____</p> <p>I agree with X’s and Y’s points, but I maintain that _____ because _____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>1, because I’m not really sure how to score this. On the one hand, it has explorative aspects because students are expected to walk through all the issues then come up with their own original points. On the other hand, it has a touch of advocacy to it (because of the suggestion they’re talking about something) and it really doesn’t have any academic/professional feel, although I classify this book as A/P</p>
Chapter 2, “Analyzing an Argument,” selected for review because of its focus on analyzing arguments help us to see how the authors deconstruct, thereby implicitly construct, arguments.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>(p. 32) Like rhetorical analysis effective visual analysis takes into account the context of the image as well as its visual elements and any surrounding text first look carefully at the image itself what visual elements grab your attention first and how do other details reinforce that impression -- what is most important and less important? How do colors and styles influence impressions? How does the image directed viewers eyes and reinforce what is important? What is the relationship between the image and any text that might accompany it? Consider the shapes colors and details of the image as well as how the elements of the image connect with different arguments and audiences.</p> <p>Then think about context. Try to determine why and when the image was created, who created it, where it appeared, and the target audience. What elements have you seen before which elements remind you of other visuals?</p>	<p>3, because I think this is fairly effective as a lesson on writing rhetorical analyses. There are a lot of good directions given for where the student should look (e.g. what is relationship between image and text? when/why/why was the text created?) This lesson assignment has included in the chapter with it several samples of rhetorical analyses to serve as models, too.</p>
<b>Averaged Score: 2</b>	

## APPENDIX SEVEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *A Practical Study of Argument* (7<sup>th</sup> ed) by

Trudy Govier

Classification: Academic/Professional (explorative)	
Chapter 1, “What is an argument? (And what is not?),” selected for review because it’s purpose is to describe the author’s conception of what, exactly, an argument <i>is</i> .	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>(EXERCISE 1 PART A pp. 11, 12, 13) for each of the following passages, determine whether it does or does not contain an argument, and give reasons for your judgment. If the passage does contain an argument, indicate the conclusion. Answers to exercises marked in an*are provided in the back of the book.</p> <p>2. The sun was setting on the hillside when he left. The air had a peculiar smoky aroma, the leaves were beginning to fall, and he sensed all around him the faintly melancholy atmosphere that comes when summer and summer romances are about to end.</p> <p>4. If a diet does not work, then that is a problem. But if a diet does work, there is still a problem, because the diet will have altered the dieters metabolism. An altered metabolism as a result of dieting means a person will need less food. Eating less food, the person will gain weight more easily. Therefore, dieting to lose weight is futile.</p> <p>6. The patient's bone density is calculated by a computer and the readings provided are then compared to others, which are standard for persons of the same body type, sex, and age.</p> <p>9. “The reaction of many people when they first hear a description of the cycle path take personality is that they have known a few people who fit the bill – fellow workers, classmates, acquaintances, bosses, even perhaps, unfortunately, a spouse.”</p> <p>10. “If all goes well, the reactor and the steam generators in a nuclear power plant of the pressurized water variety maintain a stable, businesslike relationship such as might obtain between two complementary monopolies. The reactor can be thought of as a selling heat to the steam generators.”</p> <p>13. There are a lot of things that human beings do that our ancestors 1000 years ago already did. Feelings shared it include fear and mourning, and activities include joking and flirting. In these sorts of areas human beings haven't changed a lot. But when we begin to think instead of</p>	<p>1.25, because I have a couple concerns over this activity. First, it seems to beat a dead horse after the first couple tries. It’s not especially difficult to discern what is and is not an argument, so it seems as many of 19 such questions would hardly be necessary. The seeming redundancy isn’t as big as my second concern, though, which is that these activities seem little equipped to teach students how to actually write arguments.</p>

<p>things like science and Analogy, then at that point today's human beings do seem very different from our ancestors. We have more wealth, more power, and more understanding.</p> <p>15. "Never cease loving a person and never give up hope for him, for even the predigital society who has fallen most low could still be saved, the bitterest enemy and also he who was your friend could again be your friend; love that has grown cold can kindle again." (Soren Kierkegaard)</p> <p>17. "On March 15, 2004, France's Jacques Chiracs signed a law banning large symbols of religious affiliations in public schools. The law is based on report of the French Stasi commission, set up to reflect on the applications of secularism. Officially, the law is on the grounds that Austin teenage displays of religious affiliation violate the secular nature of the public school system, as France is a secular society. Only large, visible religious symbols such as Muslim headscarves, Sikh turbans and Jewish yarmulkes are bad, while small Christian crosses are deemed acceptable, as are small stars of David. It is widely acknowledged that the primary focus of the new law is the mud Muslim headscarf called the hijab." (Letter to the editor, humanist perspectives Spring 2005, by Carolyn Colijn.)</p> <p>18. "Soldiers who wish to be a hero/are practically zero/but those who wish to be civilians/Jesus, they run into the millions." (Anonymous poem quoted in an advertisement placed by Penguin Canada in the Globe and Mail March 22, 2003.)</p>	
<p>(EXERCISE 2 PART A pp. 17, 18, 19). For each of the following passages, state whether it does or does not contain an argument. If you think that the passage does contain an argument, briefly state why and identify its conclusion. If you think that the passage is not an argument, briefly state why.</p> <p>1 The cause of the confusion was an ambiguous exit sign.</p> <p>3. Good health depends on good nutrition. Good nutrition requires a budget adequate to buy some fresh fruits and vegetables. Therefore, good health requires a budget adequate to buy some fresh fruits and vegetables.</p> <p>4. "If Rudolph Guiliani did one good thing for the arts while he was mayor of New York, it was to give the usual arguments on behalf of scandalous art so many chances to be aired that it soon became clear how unsatisfying they are."</p> <p>(Judith Schulevitz, "Shock Art: Round Up the Usual Defenses," New York Times Book Review, March 23, 2003)</p> <p>5. It is not strictly true that all human beings are either male or female. That's because some human beings are</p>	<p>1.25 ditto my concerns regarding Exercise 1.</p>

born with mixed sexual characteristics.

7. Due to pride some people find it easier than others due to admit that they are wrong. You can see that this is true. It works this way: their pride is based on a deep conviction of personal worth. As a result of their current fiction that they are worthy people, they can admit to floss without being threatened.

10. Because she was an only child, she did not develop the independence necessary to care for herself. For example, even at the age of seven, she was unable to put on her own skates.

12. If a person knows in advance that his actions risked death, then when he voluntarily takes those actions, he accepts the risk of death. These conditions surely amount to a mountain climbers. Therefore, people who climb mountains have accepted the risk of death.

14. Background: the following passage is taken from Edward C. Banefield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. Banefield's is a striving life among peasant people in a small Italian village called Montegrano, as it was in the early 1950s.

“In part of the peasants melancholy is caused by worry. Having no savings, he must always dread what is likely to happen. What for others are misfortunes are for him calamity's. When there hauled strangled on its tether, a laborer and his wife were desolate. The woman tore her hair and beat her head against the wall while the husband sat mute and stricken in a corner. The loss of the hog meant they would have no meet that winter. No grease to spread on bread, nothing to sell for cash to pay taxes, and no possibility of acquiring a pig the next three. Such blows may fall at any time. Fields may be washed away in a flood. Hail maybe down the wheat. Illness may strike. To be a peasant is to stand helpless before these possibilities.” (Edward C. Banefield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society* [Chicago: Free Press, 1958] p. 64)

15. Background: this passage is taken from the essay “On Liberty,” by the 19th century philosopher John Stuart Mill, who defends freedom of speech.

The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth. If wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.

18. “One immediate retort to the idea that a market society without governing institution is a decent society is that a

<p>market society includes economic organizations, particularly monopolies and cartels, which are in fact governing institutions. The course of power of monopolies is no less than that of political institutions. That's the idea that a market society is free of institutions that have the power to humiliate people is a fairytale.”  (Avashi Margalit, <i>The Decent Society</i>. [Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.], p. 21)  19.0” the cancer rarely overpowered by life's anniversaries because a set of safety valves to release the mental anguish caused by their personal hangups. Lucy for example flaunts her femininity so she did cope with life more easily. Charlie Brown eats peanut butter sandwiches when he gets lonely. And freed illegals complements to restore her faith in herself and in her curly hair. Snoopy, unashamed, straps himself to his doghouse and mentally shrugs off most anything he can't handle.”  (From Jeffrey H. Loria, <i>What's It All About, Charlie Brown?</i> [Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publishers, 1968] p. 12)</p>	
<p>(EXERCISE 2: PART B p. 20)  Think of a particular person, such as a friend, relative, or coworker whom you'd know quite well, and list five claims that you might at some time wish to explain to that person. Now list five different claims that you might at some time wish to justify to that person by offering an argument.  Look at the two lists that you have constructed for question one. What makes it reasonable to put a claim on one of the lists rather than the other? (That is, how do you say whether the claim would be more appropriately explained or justified to your friend?)</p>	<p>2 because, while, this is getting closer to the task of teaching students how to actually write arguments, 1) it stops at brainstorming, when we need the student to learn how to complete the writing of a full argumentative essay; 2) As set up now, without the insistence the student first critically evaluate her own lists and/or refer to outside sources, runs the risk of the student falling back on uncritical and/or logically fallacious arguments.</p>
<p>Chapter 2, “Writing Effective Arguments,” selected for review because “effective” indicates the author’s conception of what an argument is supposed to look like.</p>	
<b>Lesson(s) Analyzed</b>	<b>Score &amp; Justification</b>
<p>(EXERCISE 1 pp. 32, 33)  Examine the following passages to determine whether they contain arguments for those passages that do contain arguments, rewrite them in standardized form, numbering premises and conclusion(s). Note any subarguments and indicate the main argument and the main conclusion.  Note: some of the following passages do not contain arguments and therefore do not contain premises or conclusions. If you think that a passage does not contain an argument, explain briefly why it does not.  1. If a car has reliable breaks, it has breaks that work in wet weather. The brakes on my car don't work very well in wet weather. You can see that my car does not have</p>	<p>3, because it is important for students to be able to identify the main components in an argument. Further, the instruction for students to rewrite the arguments in standard form is good practice to help students master the genre of standard written argument.</p>

<p>reliable breaks.</p> <p>3. When unemployment among youth go up, hooliganism and getting violence going to. You could see from this evidence that unemployment is probably a major cause of these disruptions. Therefore people who say getting violence is caused by drugs have got it all wrong.</p> <p>5. Every religion I have ever study incorporates a bias against women. I conclude that all religions are biased against women.</p> <p>8. Negative thinking will bring only negative results.</p> <p>9. Background: the following passages taken from an article about the archaeopteryx, a type of dinosaur. It's [that is, the archaeopteryx] main feathers show the asymmetric, aerodynamic form typical of modern birds. This similarity proves that the feathers of the Archaeopteryx must have been used for flying. (Peter Wellnhofer, "Archaeopteryx," Scientific American, May 1990, p. 70).</p> <p>10. "Science, since the people must do it, is a socially embedded activity." (Stephen Jay Gould, The Mismeasure of Man [New York: Norton, 1981]).</p> <p>13. "The source of much of California's shakiness is, as any school child knows, the San Andreas fault. On a geological map, it isn't hard to find, but in ground truth – as geologist called their leg work – the fault can be elusive. Serpentine and secretive, it lurks just below the surface along 6/7 of California's link. A 650 mile crack in the earth, it cuts, largely unnoticed and often intentionally ignored, though almost every other geological feature of the state."</p> <p>(Shannon Brownlee, "Waiting for the Big One," Discover, July 1986, p. 56)</p> <p>15.0" everything everywhere is perishable and easily track. Whatever sets his heart on any such things must be disturbed, discouraged, a party to anxiety and distress, with desires that are unfulfilled and aversions that are fully realized. Therefore, and Ali not willing to secure the only safety that has been granted to us, and by giving up the perishable and slavish domain, work at those things that are imperishable and naturally free?"</p> <p>(Epictetus, as translated by A.A. Long, in Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002], p. 223)</p>	
<p><b>Averaged Score: 1.875</b></p>	

## APPENDIX EIGHT

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *Argument* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) by John Gooch and

Dorothy Seyler

Classification: Academic/Professional	
Chapter 1, "Making an Effective Argument," selected for review because it contains a section titled "what exactly is an argument?"	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>try it! (p. 21):</p> <p>read the following article and then complete the exercise that follows. This exercise tests both careful reading and your understanding of the differences among facts, inferences, and judgments. (Note: the article in question is titled "Paradise Lost" written by Richard Morin and discusses of savage ritualistic behaviors among South Pacific peoples in the 1700s.)</p> <p>Label each of the following sentences as F (fact), FF (false facts), I (inference), or J (judgment).</p> <p>___ 1. In the 1700s native South Pacific islanders lived in peace and harmony.</p> <p>___ 2. It is foolish to romanticize life on South Sea Islands.</p> <p>___ 3. French philosopher Rousseau based his idea on the noble savage on the Tahitians.</p> <p>___ 4. The stone statues on Easter Island suggest many stories.</p> <p>___ 5. In the past, noble Hawaiians married within their families.</p> <p>___ 6. Tahitians were savage people.</p> <p>___ 7. Some South Pacific islanders used to practice abortion and infanticide.</p> <p>___ 8. Easter Island has always had grassy plains in barren ridges.</p> <p>___ 9. Finding and using sustainable strategies will help preserve the environment.</p> <p>___ 10. People should not marry family members.</p>	<p>1.5, because, although it is certainly academic in nature to expect students to learn key terms, recognizing whether something is a fact versus a judgment does not give the student critical practice in the writing of arguments, nor does it make clear how a fact versus a false fact can serve to help students gain competence in the critical skill of drafting their own arguments.</p>
<p>EXERCISES: USING TOULMIN'S TERMS TO PLAN ARGUMENTS (p. 26):</p> <p>Expect your outline to be one to two pages.</p> <p>a. Professor X is (or is not) a good teacher.</p> <p>b. Colleges should (or should not) admit students only on the basis of academic merit.</p> <p>c. Americans need (or do not need) to reduce the fat in their diets.</p> <p>d. Physical education classes should (or should not) be graded pass/fail.</p>	<p>2.5, because it does give students practice outlining arguments, which is a good attention to the physical structure, these prompts are all adversarial/advocacy in nature; no attention to counterargument appears to have been given.</p>

<p>e. Public schools should (or should not) have dress codes.</p> <p>f. Helmets for bicyclists should (or should not) be mandatory.</p> <p>g. Sales tax on cigarette should (or should not) be increased.</p> <p>All cigarette advertising should (or should not) be prohibited.</p>	
<p>Chapter 3, "Writing Effective Arguments," selected because "effective" suggests what the authors think an argument should look like.</p>	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>try it! (p. 53)</p> <p>write the opening paragraph of the letter to each audience based on the following scenario. How might your letter differ based on these different potential letters? Would you use a different language? Include different details? Make different promises? Consider how the audience for your arguments can completely change your strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your best friend, who doesn't own a car.</li> <li>• The local banker, whom you've never met.</li> <li>• Your mom, who worries about your safety.</li> </ul> <p>Your uncle, who works for the Environmental Protection Agency.</p>	<p>3, because this is a good way to not only get students thinking about audience consideration but also gives them valuable practice in writing for different audiences.</p>
<p><b>Averaged Score: 2.33</b></p>	



## APPENDIX NINE

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *Argumentation: Understanding and*

*Shaping Arguments* by James A. Herrick

Classification: Advocacy	
Chapter 1, “Introduction to Argument,” selected because this shows what the author thinks an argument is.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>EXERCISES (P. 13, 14):</p> <p>A. Provide definitions for the following terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy</li> <li>• argument</li> <li>• argumentation</li> <li>• pluralistic culture</li> <li>• power</li> <li>• procedures</li> <li>• public discourse</li> <li>• rule of reason</li> <li>• values</li> </ul> <p>B. Identify four of your own values that might influence how you interpret information you heard or read.</p> <p>C. Suggest one conclusion that you might draw from each of the following facts. Identify the value that lead you from the fact that to your conclusion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The National Cancer Institute estimates that 400,000 people die in the United States every year from tobacco-related illnesses.</li> <li>2. More than 2000 new religions emerged in the United States during the 20th century.</li> <li>3. There are 1 million deaths each year in the US due to medical error on the part of doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and hospital staff.</li> <li>4. 55% of all deaths from gunshots each year in the US are suicides.</li> <li>5. The number of US citizens who are at or below the poverty level stands at 12% of the total population, or one in every eight people in the country.</li> <li>6. China has the fastest-growing economy in the world.</li> <li>7. The United States imports 58% of its petroleum, at a cost of more than \$150 billion annually.</li> <li>8. The United States incarcerates more than 2.3 million people – one in every 150 of its adult</li> </ol>	<p>3, because the authors make the key link between values and the justification for arguments for advocacy. I especially appreciate B and C, B because it helps students ponder their own values, which is a strong justification for the advocacy argument, and C because it then draws students out so they can realize how others’ values also link to the arguments they make.</p>

<p>citizens, the highest percentage of any country in the world.</p> <p>9. More than 80% of US children play video games more than eight hours a week.</p> <p>10. 2 million people in the United States acquire infections each year as a result of a hospital stay. More than 70,000 die from these hospital-acquired infections.</p>	
<p>Chapter 2, "Elements of Argument" dittos reasoning for selecting the first chapter; a close look at an argument's elements is an analysis of the microscopic details.</p>	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>EXERCISES (pp. 24 – 26)</p> <p>A. Provide a brief definition for each of the following terms, then check your definitions against those in the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•reason</li> <li>•conclusion</li> <li>•case</li> <li>•inference</li> <li>•logical sense</li> <li>•reservation</li> </ul> <p>B. In the following arguments, draw underlines under the conclusions. For example:</p> <p>Legalizing drugs would radically reduce crime because it would eliminate the high cost of these substances.</p> <p>1. Acquiring the stem cells necessary for human embryonic stem cell research necessitates destroying human embryos. Therefore, all human embryonic stem cell research is immoral.</p> <p>2. You must have a dream to act, and you must act to live. Thus, you must have a dream to live.</p> <p>3. The only way to deal with habitual criminals is incarceration. This is because there are only two possibilities: incarceration or rehabilitation. Though incarceration is expensive and difficult, rehabilitation simply does not work.</p> <p>4. "Wherever there are laws, there will be lawyers, and where there are lawyers, there will be arguments, for it is by argument that they earned their living. Thus, when there are laws there will be arguments."</p> <p>5. Fines and suspensions are often handed out when athletes turn violently during a game, but widely publicized brawls involving players as well as fans provide clear evidence that tougher measures are needed. Athletes who assault other athletes are fans during a game must be prosecuted under existing criminal statutes.</p> <p>C. Identify each of the following claims as propositions of fact (F), value (V), or policy (P).</p> <p>1. James Watson and Francis Crick discovered the complex and double helix structure of the DNA molecule in 1959.</p>	<p>1.75, because, while I appreciate in Lesson B. that most of the content is related to questions of value, I don't see how the mixing in of non-values such as 5 "Fines and suspensions are.." and of circular logics such as # 4 about where there are laws there will be lawyers have anything to do with advocacy. Also, A and C seem rather more geared to academic/professional than toward advocacy.</p>

2. Pictures beamed back to the Hubble telescope reveal the universe to be a place of exquisite beauty.
3. The United States should immediately pass different laws regulating the use of animals in product research.
4. The Mercedes-Benz SLR is the fastest production car on the market from 0 to 60 mi./h.
5. Same-sex marriage should be made legal in all 50 states.
6. At the current rate of consumption, Earth's reserves of oil will be depleted by 2080.
7. Saving the jobs of local farmers is more important than saving water in the region.
8. There has been a 28% increase in arrests of women for drunk driving infractions since 1990.
9. We must pass different handgun legislation immediately.
10. Tabloid headline: baby born singing Elvis tunes.

D. Draw a wavy line under the conclusion. Then, label the label the conclusion a proposition of fact, value, or policy:

1. A recent poll by the pew research Center revealed that 52% of US voters view the Republican Party as friendly to religion, while only 40% view the Democratic Party the same way. Thus, Democrats should start now to develop a strategy for winning over the deeply religious voter.
2. The number of prisoners serving life sentences has now risen to a record of 140,610, compared with 34,000 in 1984. This dramatic increase proves that new, stiffer sentencing guidelines are working to keep criminals off the street.
3. Nuclear arms have prevented war in the past, so they will do the same in the future.
4. State lotteries are morally unacceptable as they tend to cheat the poorest members of society out of their much-needed monetary resources.
5. A recent examination of databases for more than 125 United States colleges and universities receiving government funds for programs designed to reduce the number of rapes on campus revealed that fewer than one in five men responsible for sexual assault were expelled.
6. Decisions and Japanese corporations are made by groups rather than individuals. Thus, decisions in Japanese corporations are made more fairly than in US corporations.
7. Gambling is an activity that cannot be stopped. Therefore, gambling should be legalized.
8. The United States failure to intervene in Wanda during the 1993 genocide was unconscionable, as this failure revealed an attorney disregard for human rights.
9. Americans have gained 28 years in life expect to see in the past century. This finding proves that the current system of medical care is working to preserve and improve

health. 10. Instituting a military draft should take place immediately because this is the only equitable way to staff our Armed Forces.	
<b>Averaged score: 2.75</b>	

## APPENDIX TEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *College Argument: Understanding the*

*Genre* by Irene L. Clark

Classification: Academic/Professional (advocacy)	
Chapter 1, “College Argument and the Rhetorical Situation,” selected for review because this first chapter would seem to shed light on what argument <i>is</i> according to the author, as well as place it in firm context with the genre of the college argument by title alone, not to mention the specific attention to the rhetorical situation.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>QUESTIONS (p. 19)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the exigence in this essay?</li> <li>2. What is the purpose of this essay?</li> <li>3. What strategies does John use to support his thesis?</li> <li>4. How does John’s essay use the structure associated with academic argument?</li> </ol>	<p>2.5 because I appreciate how well on the target of genre/surface structure this lesson plan takes, as well as how the asking of questions engages students to actively and openly think (as opposed to dictating commands such as “do this!”), it feels like there could be a little more meat here, a little more teasing out of the assignment.</p>
Chapter 10, “The Function of Form (of an Argument) because	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>FUNCTION OUTLINE WORKSHEET (pp. 249, 250):</p> <p>A Function Outline consists of brief statements about how each paragraph functions within an essay in terms of its relationship either to the thesis or to one of its supporting points Mike: the purpose of writing a Function Outline is to focus attention on thesis development and coherence and to initiate revision. Function outlines may be written either in the margins of the essay itself or on a separate sheet of paper, such as the Function Outline worksheet below:</p> <p>Steps for Writing a Function Outline</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number all the paragraphs in your essay.</li> <li>2. Highlight or underline the thesis statement. Write the thesis statement below.</li> </ol> <p>Thesis Statement:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Skim the essay, highlighting the main supporting points. Briefly summarize these points below.</li> </ol> <p>First Main Point</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Second Main Point</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>3, because this is an excellent example of my conception of academic/professional argument being about the physical structure of the argument, in the attention this lesson pays to its internal structure. Also, the injected _____ line spaces opens opportunities for students to write right there in the handbook, as well as in a notebook, computer, etc.</p>

<hr/> <hr/> <p>Third Main Point</p> <hr/> <hr/> <p>Fourth Main Point</p> <hr/> <hr/> <p>Fifth Main Point</p> <hr/> <hr/> <p>4. Skim the essay, paragraph by paragraph, noting how each one functions as the main point of the essay. As you read, think about the following questions: does the paragraph develop a main supporting point? Does it provide background material? Is it an example? Does it present a counter argument? Locate specific words or cueing devices in the paragraph you refer back to the thesis and remind the reader of the main point to be developed. If cueing devices do not appear, think about what material you might want to add.</p> <p>Other questions to consider: other leases in the paragraph that seem to head in another, perhaps related, direction. If so, can these sections be refocused or do you wish to modify the thesis to accommodate a potential new direction?</p> <p>In the space below, indicate the function of each paragraph in your essay.</p> <p>Paragraph # 1</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p>...</p> <p>Paragraph # 6</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p>Having worked through the entire essay, note which areas of the paper need modification or elaboration. Do you feel that the thesis statement should be modified in any way? If so, what new cueing and support would be needed?</p>	
<p><b>Averaged score: 2.75</b></p>	

## APPENDIX ELEVEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *Critical Thinking, Reading and Writing:*

*A Brief Guide to Argument* by Sylvan Barnet and Hugo Bedau

Classification: Explorative	
Chapter 3, "Critical Reading: Getting Deeper Into Arguments," selected for analysis because this project is all about the looking microscopically about arguments.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING (PP. 113, 114)</p> <p>1. What, if anything, makes Will's essay interesting? What, if anything, makes it highly persuasive? How might it be made more persuasive?</p> <p>2. In paragraph 10, Will clowns a bit about the gas that cows emit, but apparently this gas, which contributes to global warming, is no laughing matter. The government of New Zealand, in an effort to reduce livestock emissions of methane and nitrous oxide, proposed a tax that would subsidize future research on the omissions. The tax would cost the average farmer \$300 a year. Imagine that you are New Zealand farmer. Write a letter to your representative, arguing for or against attacks.</p> <p>3. Sen. Barbara boxer, campaigning against the proposal to drill in ANWR, spoke of the refuge as "God's gift to us" (New York Times, March 20, 2002). How strong an argument is she offering? Some opponents of drilling have said that drilling in ANWR is as unthinkable as drilling in Yosemite or the Grand Canyon. Again, how strong is this argument? Can you imagine circumstances in which you would support drilling in these laces? Do we have a moral duty to preserve certain unspoiled areas?</p> <p>4. The Inupiat (Eskimo) who live in and near ANWR by large majorities favor drilling, seeing it as a source of jobs and a source of funding for schools, hospitals, and police. But the Ketchikan Indian, who speak of themselves as the "Caribou People," see drilling as a threat to the herds that they depend on for food and hides. How does one balance the conflicting needs of these two groups?</p> <p>5. Opponents of drilling in ANWR argued that over it's lifetime of 50 years, the area would produce less than 1% of the fuel we need during the period and that therefore we should not risk disturbing the area. Further, they argue that journaling in ANWR is an attempt at a quick fix to US energy needs, whereas what is needed are sustainable solutions, such as the development of renewable energy sources (e.g. wind and sun) and fuel</p>	<p>1, because, while I think if analyzed and scored independently of my three-use rubric, this would be a fine exercise set, it does not fit with the criteria I set for its explorative category. Instead, it seems to contradict in key ways from the premise the authors set up as explorative because it seems mostly advocacy, with hints of academic/profession thrown into the mix.</p>

efficient automobiles. How convincing do you find these arguments?

6. Proponents of drilling include a large majority-something like 75%-of the people in Alaska, including its governor and its two senators. How much attention should be paid to their voices?

7. Analyze the essay in terms of its use of ethos, pathos, and logos.

8. What sort of audience do you think Will is addressing? What values do his readers probably share? What makes you think so?

TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING (P. 120):

1. Jimenez admits at least one important argument that advocates of state run lotteries sometimes offer: if our state doesn't run a lottery, residents will simply go to nearby states to buy tickets, so we just will be losing revenue that other states pick up; pork people will still be spending money that they can't afford, and our state will in no way benefit. What do you suppose Jimenez might say as a reply? And what is your view of this argument?

2. A bit of humor appears at the end of Jimenez is the second paragraph. Is it appropriate? Or is the essay to sell him, too preachy? If you think it is too preachy, cites some sentences, and then revise them to make them more acceptable.

3. What you say are the strengths and weaknesses of this essay? What grade would you give it, and why? If you were the instructor in this first year composition course, what comment (three or four sentences) would you write at the end of the essay?

4. This essay was written in a composition course. If you were the editor of your college's newspaper, might you run it as an op Ed piece? Why or why not?

TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING (P. 125):

1. What is the thesis of Takaki's essay? What is the evidence he offers for its truth? Do you find his argument convincing? Explain your answers to these big Russians in an essay of 500 words. Alternatively, write a 500 word blog post that responds to this essay.

2. Takaki several times uses the two sticks to make a point. What affect do the statistics have on the reader? Do some of the statistics seem more convincing than others? Explain.

3. Consider Takaki's title. To what group(s) is the myth of Asian superiority harmful?

4. Suppose you believed that Asian-Americans are economically more successful in America today, relative to white Americans, that African-Americans are. Does Takaki agree or disagree with you? What evidence, if any,



does the site to support or reject the belief or should mark

5. Takaki attacks the “myth” of Asian American success and thus rejects the idea that they are a “model minority” (recall the opening and closing paragraphs)/ what do you think a genuine model minority would be like? Can you think of any racial or ethnic minority in the United States that can serve as a model? Explain why or why not in an essay of 500 words.

TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING  
(p. 131):

1. why do you suppose Webley professes her argument by telling us in aircraft you that some of the stories on the occupy student debt site are “heart-wrenching”?
2. What do you think of Welby’s final paragraph as a way of ending her essay?
3. Do you have any ideas about forgiving student debts that are not touched on in Webly’s essay? If so, what are they? How would you work them into the essay?

TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING  
(p. 139, 140):

1. Imagine a. When the book-or even the handwritten manuscript-was not yet invented. Now look at Turkle’s first paragraph. Think of someone saying what Turkle says, but saying it at the invention of writing, and of the manuscript or book.
2. In paragraph 3 Turkel says that that the little devices that we carry change not only what we do, but also who we are. We might reply that, yes, of course, almost everything that touches his changes who we are. The invention of the movie theater changes us: instead of conversing with family or friends, and generating our own entertainment, we sat isolated in the dark for several hours. The possession of an automobile changes us, the move to a new address brings us into contact with new people will make changes-we may even marry one of them-and certainly the engendering of children changes us (or it ought to). But do you agree with Turkle that the recent electronic devices produce changes of an unexpected sort?
3. In paragraph 14 Turkle suggests that we communicate electronically, as opposed to when we communicate face-to-face or with pen and paper, “we dumbed down communications, even on the most important matters.” Is she describing your behavior? Explain.
4. In paragraph 23 Turkle says, “we flee from solitude, our ability to be separate and gather ourselves.” Is this passage to for you? Explain. My case be made that, far from being lonely, people who use Facebook and comparable sites are often stimulated to participate in civic and political activities? Does your experience offering

evidence, one way or the other? Explain. 5. Do you think Turkle's final two paragraphs make an effective ending? Explain.	
Chapter 5, "Writing an Analysis of an Argument," selected for analysis because the attention is on the micro-structure, especially of interest in the Academic/Professional category.	
<b>Lesson Analyzed</b>	<b>Score &amp; Justification</b>
<p>TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING (p. 188):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is Kristof's thesis? (State it in one sentence.)</li> <li>2. Does Kristof make any assumptions – tacit or explicit – with which you disagree? With which you agree? Write them down</li> <li>3. is a slightly humorous tone of Kristof's essay inappropriate for a discussion of deliberately killing wild animals? Why, or why not?</li> <li>4. If you are familiar with Bambi, does the story make any argument against killing deer, or does the story appeal only to our emotions?</li> <li>5. Do you agree that "hunting is as natural as birdwatching" (para. 21)? In any case, do you think that an appeal to what is "natural" is a good argument for expanding the use of hunting?</li> <li>6. To whom is Kristof talking? How do you know?</li> </ol> <p>TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING (p. 203):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In his final paragraph Jones mentions that the Tory and treatment of sexuality. Why does he bring this in? Does his use of this point make for an effective ending? Explain.</li> <li>2. In an essay of 300 words, explain whether you think Jones has made the case for violence in an effective and persuasive way. If so, what is it about his article that makes it effective and persuasive? If it is not, where does the problem lie?</li> <li>3. What kinds of violence does Jones advocate?</li> <li>4. Does violence play as large a part in the life of teenage girls as it does in the life of teenage boys? Why, or why not?</li> <li>5. How would you characterize the audience Jones is addressing? What is your evidence?</li> </ol>	<p>1, for same reasons as above. While they are good questions, they're clearly under advocacy with hints of academic/professional, more so than under exploration.</p>
<b>Averaged score: 1</b>	

## APPENDIX TWELVE

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *Dialogues: An Argument Reader and*

*Text* by Gary Goshgarian and Kathleen Krueger

Classification: Explorative (advocacy)	
Chapter 1, “Understanding Persuasion: Thinking Like a Negotiator,” selected for review because I want to see how the authors explain how students should understand what persuasion is.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>EXERCISES (pp. 24, 25):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Try to determine from the following list which subjects are arguable and which are not. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Letter grades in all college courses should be replaced by pass/fail grades.</li> <li>b. Sororities and fraternities are responsible for binge drinking among college students.</li> <li>c. Lobster is my favorite seafood.</li> <li>d. Prof. Greene is one of the best professors on campus.</li> <li>e. Children are better off if they are raised in a traditional nuclear family.</li> <li>f. Advertisements now often appear in commercial films using a strategy called product placement.</li> <li>g. Minorities make up only 10% of upper management positions in corporate America.</li> <li>h. The Earth's population will be 7 billion by the year 2011.</li> <li>i. Juveniles who commit serious crimes should be sent to adult prisons.</li> <li>j. Last night's sunset over the mountains was spectacular.</li> <li>k. Advertisers often mislead the public about the benefits of their products.</li> <li>l. AIDS testing for healthcare workers should be mandatory.</li> <li>m. Bilingual education programs fail to help non-English-speaking children become part of mainstream society.</li> <li>n. Scenes of the Nativity often displayed at Christmas time should not be allowed on public property.</li> <li>o. The tsunami that struck Asia in December of 2004 is the worst natural disaster in recorded history.</li> <li>p. Couples should have to get a license before having children.</li> <li>q. Given all the billions of galaxies and billions of stars in each galaxy, there must be life elsewhere.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>2, because this is a toss-up. Although I categorize this as explorative based on Phase 1, how the authors discuss argumentation in the introductory section, I do give it the subclassification of advocacy. Most of the prompts here are advocacy in nature.</p>

<p>r. Secondhand smoke causes cancer.</p> <p>2. In your argument notebook, create a pro/con checklist for the following topics. Make two columns: Pro on one side, con on the other. If possible, team up with other students to brainstorm opposing points on each issue. Try to come up with five or six solid points and counterpoints.</p> <p>a. I think women are better listeners than men.</p> <p>b. If a juvenile is charged with a serious crime and his/her parents are found to be negligent, the parents should be charged with a crime as well.</p> <p>c. “Hard” sciences such as math are more difficult than “soft” sciences such as sociology.</p> <p>d. There should be a mandatory nationwide ban of cigarette smoking in all places of work including office buildings, restaurants, bars, and clubs.</p> <p>e. The University should reduce tuition for students who maintain an A average during the previous year.</p> <p>f. ROTC should be made available to all students in U.S. colleges and universities.</p> <p>g. The majority of American people support prayer in school.</p> <p>h. Mandatory national ID cards would reduce the threat of terrorism in this country.</p> <p>3. Use one of these topics to constructive dialogue in which the objective is not to oppose the other side but to respond constructively to its concerns. As a first step, analyze the reasons provided by both sides and make a list of their concerns, noting whether any are shared. Then trade it dialogue that might take place between the two. Write about a recent experience in which Julie tried to convince someone of something. What reasons did you use to make your claim convincing? Which were most successful? What were the opposing reasons? How did you respond?</p>	
<p>Chapter 2, “Reading Arguments: Thinking like a Critic,” selected for review because I am interested in seeing how the authors read (and interpret) arguments other than their own</p>	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>EXERCISES (pp. 57, 58)</p> <p>1. in your journal, list examples of logical fallacies you find in essays, news articles, editorials, advertising, junk mail, and other persuasive materials that you confront I daily basis. Based on the information you and other group members collect, draw some hypotheses about which fallacies are most prevalent today and why. If your instructor asks you to do so, convert these hypotheses into an outline of an argument essay for your campus newspaper.</p> <p>2. Explain the faulty logic of the following statements. Of what fallacy (or fallacies) is each an example?</p>	<p>3, because I think it is important to discuss logical fallacies in terms of the explorative argument, because one way to explore arguments further is to quickly rule out its illogics.</p>

<p>a. When did you stop hiring other people to take your exams for you?</p> <p>b. He's too smart to play football; besides, he broke his legs 10 years ago.</p> <p>c. If we don't stop the publication of this X-rated material now, it won't be long before our children will be reading it at school.</p> <p>d. Karen must be depressed; she wore dark clothes all weekend.</p> <p>e. How can you accuse me of being late? You're such a slowpoke.</p> <p>f. Rap music is a music because it's just noise and words.</p> <p>g. He's at least 6'6" tall, so he must be a terrific basketball player.</p> <p>h. WGBB is the most popular radio station on campus because it has more listeners than any other station.</p> <p>i. Indians living on reservations get the necessities of life and government expense, so they have no worries.</p> <p>j. Take Tummy Talks laxative instead of Mellow Malt, because Tummy Talks contains calcium while mellow malt has aluminum and magnesium.</p> <p>k. Lite Cheese Popcorn contains 34 percent fewer calories!</p> <p>Any decent person will agree that Nazism has no place in modern society.</p>	
<b>Averaged Score: 2.5</b>	

## APPENDIX THIRTEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *Elements of Argument: A Text and Reader* by Annette T. Rottenberg and Donna Haisty Winchell

Classification: Academic/Professional (advocacy)	
Chapter 2, "Critical Reading," chosen for analysis because it contains sections on strategies for comprehending and evaluating arguments, of interest considering my project – to see how these authors and editors think about argument.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Assignments for Critical Reading (pp. 73, 74):</p> <p><b>READING AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This into a recording of Martin Luther King Jr.'s I have a dream and discuss how the language of the speech adds power to the ideas.</li> <li>2. Watch (and listen to) one of the afternoon television talk shows in which guests discuss a controversial social problem. (The TV Guide a daily newspapers and online listings often list the subject. Past topics include one parent subject their children, when children kill children, and when surgery changes patient's lives.) Analyze the discussion, considering the major claims, the most important evidence, and the declared or hidden warrants. How much did the oral format contribute to success or failure of the arguments?</li> <li>3. Watch one episode of either the daily show with Jon Stewart or the Colbert report and discuss how the show, successfully or not, tries to use humor to make serious points about political and/or social issues.</li> <li>4. Stephen Johnson, author of the ghost map (2006) writes, "it has become a cliché to say that we now live in a society where image is valued over substance, where our desires are continually stroked by the illusory fuel of marketing messages." Do you believe that we live in the society Johnson describes? Explain.</li> <li>5. Located advertisement that you find visually and verbally interesting. Using as a model of the analysis of the ad for encompass insurance paid 71 what sorts of observations can you make about your ad? Exchange adds with a classmate and discuss whether the two of you respond the same way to each ad.</li> <li>6. Find two articles on opposing sides of controversial issues such as abortion, gay marriage, our offshore drilling. Determine what common grounds the two authors share. Then share parent articles with classmates and discuss other examples of common ground.</li> </ol> <p><b>WRITING SUGGESTIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Write an essay analyzing sex in the cinema (p. 43). You may choose to support an evaluative claim that</li> </ol>	<p>3, because there is so much attention to the interaction of getting students to think about argument in terms of structure, audience, and genre. Also, the subclassification shows up beautifully here because the reading-discussion prompts are related to values-based topics.</p>

<p>analyzes how effective the essay is or one that objectively analyzes how the essay is written.</p> <p>8. Writing essay evaluating “the gay option” (p. 57).</p> <p>9. Do you agree with Alfie Kohn in “No-Win Situations” (p. 51) by games and sports should not be so competitive? Write an essay explaining why or why not</p> <p>10. Choose an editorial from your school newspaper or local newspaper and right and a valuation of it.</p> <p>11. Watch one of the television talk shows that features experts on social and clinical issues, such as the O’Reilly factor, Hannity and Colmes, or The McLaughlin Group. Write a review, telling how much you learned about the subjects of discussion. Be specific about the features of the show that were either helpful or not helpful to your understanding/</p> <p>12. Choose an advertisement, taking into consideration both the visual and the verbal. Turn your observation into the thesis of an essay explaining the ad’s argument.</p> <p>13. Find a picture that you believe makes a political statement and write an analysis, making clear what you believe that statement is.</p> <p>14. Find two pictures that present either complementary or conflicting arguments. Write an essay explaining the arguments.</p> <p>Write an essay explaining what visual images represent your school and why.</p>	
<p>Chapter 11, “The Argumentative Paper: Writing and Documentation,” selected for review not so much because I am interested in how the authors say argument should be written, as this indicates how they think the ideal argument looks like.</p>	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Writer’s Guide: Checklist for Argumentative Papers</p> <p>1. Present a thesis that interest both of to you, and the audience, is debatable, and can be defended in the amount of space available.</p> <p>2. Backup each statement offering in support of the thesis with enough evidence to give it credibility. Site data from a variety of sources. Fully document all quotations and direct references to primary or secondary sources.</p> <p>3. The words linking claims to support must be either specified or implicit in your data and line of reasoning. No claim should depend on an unstated warrant and with which skeptical readers might disagree.</p> <p>4. Present the thesis clearly and adequately introduce it in a thesis paragraph, indicating the purpose of the paper.</p> <p>5. Organize supporting statements and data in a way that builds the argument, emphasizes your main ideas, and justifies the paper's conclusions.</p> <p>6. Anticipate all possible opposing arguments and either refute or accommodate them.</p>	<p>2.5, because it has many of the good qualifications I mentioned above, but it lacks the same luster and development.</p>

7. Write in a style and tone appropriate for the topic and the intended audience. Your pro should be clear and readable.	
8. Make sure your manuscript is clean, carefully proofed, and typed in an acceptable format.	
<b>Averaged score: 2.75</b>	



## APPENDIX FOURTEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *Everything's an Argument* by Andrea A.

Lunsford and John J. Ruszkiewicz

Classification: Academic/Professional (exploration)	
Chapter 1, "Everything's an Argument," selected because it includes a section on why we make arguments, on stasis, and on rhetorically analyzing arguments.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>RESPOND. (p. 17): in a recent magazine, newspaper, or blog, find three editorials – one that makes a forensic argument, one a deliberative argument, and one as ceremonial argument. Analyze the arguments by asking these questions: Who is arguing? What purposes are the writers trying to achieve? To whom are they directing their arguments? Then decide whether the arguments' purposes have been achieved and how you know.</p> <p>RESPOND. (p. 28):</p> <p>What common experiences, if any, do the following objects, brand names, and symbols evoke, and for what audiences in particular? What sorts of appeals to they make: to Pathos, Ethos, or Logos?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a USDA organic label</li> <li>• the Golden Arches</li> <li>• the Sean John label as seen on its website</li> <li>• A can of Coca-Cola</li> <li>• sleeping beauty's Castle on the Disney logo</li> <li>• Opera Winfrey</li> <li>• the Vietnam Veterans Memorial</li> <li>• Ground Zero at the World Trade Center site</li> <li>• an AIDS ribbon</li> </ul> <p>RESPOND. (p. 29)</p> <p>Take a look at the bumper sticker below, and then analyze it. What is its purpose? What kind of argument is it? Which of the stasis questions does it most appropriately respond to? To what audiences doesn't appeal? What appeals doesn't make and how?</p>	<p>2.75, because the exercises are spot-on as far as mechanical structure, e.g., attention to audience and physical structure (e.g., has argument been constructed in a way most befitting to intended audience?) I do not grant a full 3 though, because these are good brainstorming activities while not being structured to bring about full argument essays from them.</p>
Chapter 6" Rhetorical Analysis," selected for analysis because, again, the attention is on analysis, so will give clearer indication of how the authors think arguments should look like.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>RESPOND. (p. 95):</p> <p>Browse YouTube or another website to find an example of a powerful emotional argument that's made visually, describe a persuasive moment that you can recall from his speech, and editorial, an advertisement, a YouTube clip, or a blog posting. Or research with the following famous</p>	<p>2.25 because, while I appreciate the attention to the physical structure (including training on the often-underrepresented visual argument), this reads more attentive to advocacy</p>

<p>persuasive moments and describes the circumstances – this historical situation, the issues at stake, the purpose of the argument – that make it so memorable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg address (1863)</li> <li>• Elizabeth Cady Stanton's declaration of sentiments at the Seneca Falls convention (1848)</li> <li>• Chief Techumseh's address to Gen. William Henry Harrison (1810)</li> <li>• Winston Churchill's addresses to the British people during World War II (1940)</li> <li>• Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (1963)</li> <li>• Ronald Reagan's tribute to the Challenger astronauts (1986)</li> <li>• Toni Morrison speech accepting the Nobel Prize (1993)</li> <li>• Will.i.am and the black-eyed peas yes we can song/collage on YouTube (2008)</li> </ul> <p>RESPOND. (p. 100):</p> <p>Browse YouTube or another website to find an example of a powerful emotional argument that's made visually, either alone or using words as well. In a paragraph, defend a claim about how the argument works. For example, does an image itself make a claim, or does it draw you in to consider a verbal claim? What emotion does the argument generate? How does that emotion work to persuade you?</p> <p>RESPOND. (p. 107):</p> <p>Find a recent example of a visual argument, either in print or on the Internet. Even though you may have a copy of the image, describing carefully in your paper on the assumption that your description is all readers may have to go on. Then make a judgment about its effectiveness, supporting your claim with clear evidence from the "text."</p> <p>RESPOND. (p. 120):</p> <p>Find an argument on the editorial page or op Ed page in recent is paper. Then analyze a rhetorically, using principles discussed in this chapter. Show Holly it succeeds, fails, or does something awesome entirely. Perhaps you could show that the author is unusually successful in connecting with readers but then has nothing to say. Or perhaps you discover that the strong logical peel is undercut by contradictory emotional argument. Be sure that the analysis includes a summary of the original essay and basic publication of mission about it (it's author, place of publication, and publisher).</p>	<p>argumentation methods, over the academic/professional.</p>
<p><b>Averaged score: 2.5</b></p>	

## APPENDIX FIFTEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis on *From Critical Thinking to Argument* by

Sylvan Barnet and Hugo Bedau

Classification: Explorative	
Chapter 5, "Writing an Analysis of an Argument," selected because analysis helps us look at how the authors determine arguments' deep structures.	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>TOPICS FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND WRITING (P. 158):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is Kristof's chief thesis? (State it in one sentence.)</li> <li>2. Does Kristof make any assumptions – tacit or explicit – with which you disagree? With which you agree? Write them down.</li> <li>3. Is a slightly humorous tone of Kristof's essay inappropriate for a discussion of deliberately killing wild animals? Why, or why not?</li> <li>4. If you are familiar with Bambi, does the story make any argument against killing deer, or does the story appeal only to our emotions?</li> <li>5. Do you agree that "hunting is as natural as birdwatching" (para. 21)? In any case, do you think that an appeal to what is "natural" is a good argument for expanding the use of hunting?</li> <li>6. To whom is Kristof talking? How do you know?</li> </ol> <p>EXERCISE (p. 166):</p> <p>Take one of the essays not yet discussed in class or an essay is fine now by your instructor, and in an essay of 500 words analyze and evaluating, guided by the check list examples we are provided.</p>	<p>1.75 because while there is some attention to exploration (e.g., "Does Kristoff make any assumptions...") the tone here is much more academic/professional than it is explorative.</p>
Chapter 6, "Developing an Argument of Your Own," selected for analysis because	
Lesson Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>EXERCISE (pp. 212, 213):</p> <p>In a brief essay, state a claim and support it with evidence. Choose an issue in which you are genuinely interested and about which you already know something. You may want to interview a few experts and do some reading, but don't try to write a highly researched paper. Sample topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students in laboratory courses should not be required to participate in the dissection of animals.</li> <li>2. Washington DC should be granted statehood.</li> <li>3. Women should, in wartime, be exempted from serving in combat.</li> <li>4. The annual Miss America contest is an insult to women.</li> </ol>	<p>1.75 for same reasons as stated above.</p>

5. The government should not offer financial support to the arts.	
6. The chief all of the curriculum in high school was...	
7. No specific courses should be required in colleges or universities.	
<b>Averaged score: 1.75</b>	

## APPENDIX SIXTEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for *Inventing Arguments* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed) by John

Mauk and John Metz

Classification: Explorative (academic/professional)	
Chapter 1, “Inventing Arguments,” was selected for examination because it includes sections critical to this dissertation investigation, especially the sections “What is Argument?” and “What is an academic argument?”	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Activities (p. 7):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With several others, they've the following: why do opinions change? Share your initial thinking, and then explore other possibilities. Consider particular opinion she once held but that changed.</li> <li>2. In a small group, make a list of careers that people prepare for in college, such as doctor, accountant, marketing specialist, nutritionist, and so on. Then discuss how college education teaches students in each field to view the world in a particular way.</li> <li>3. What arguments make of the national debate about the war in Afghanistan?</li> <li>4. What arguments are put forth in the preamble of the Declaration of Independence?</li> </ol> <p>Activities (p. 12):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Think of a recent college class. Make a list of all the rhetorical strategies of the instructor and the students. Consider all the subcode explicit ways that the ends structures work to bring students into a way of thinking – about the class, the rules, rewards, the penalties. And consider how students work to persuade instructors of their abilities, the dedication, or even their apathy about the course. Consider particular language, phrasing, words, suggestions.</li> <li>2. Make a list of the situations from history or current events in which rhetoric has been used for good or bad purposes.</li> <li>3. Describe a situation in the past 24 hours in which you made a rhetorical decision.</li> </ol> <p>Activities (p. 15):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Closely examine the discussion among Jack, Linda, and Diana. Describe the specific points of the conversation that takes your ideas beyond Jack's initial opinion. Describe, in specific terms, how Diana and Linda help Jack go from his initial opinion to more complex insight.</li> <li>2. With a small group of peers (in class or online),</li> </ol>	<p>2.75, because I appreciate the attention toward “opinions changing” and the work of describing specific points of taking one’s ideas “beyond Jack’s “initial opinion.” Still, there is misguided attention to “a rhetorical decision” and rhetorical strategies used by the professor, which makes this float over toward the academic/professional.</p>

<p>develop an idea from an initial opinion to a more complex insight (as Jack, Linda, and Diana do on page 14). Keep a running record of the conversation. Try to trace the progression of thought. After the discussion, answer the following:</p> <p>a. What new ideas (new ways of thinking about the topic) emerged?</p> <p>b. What prompted the new way of thinking – a probing question, a provocative statement, a debate about some particular word or phrase?</p> <p>At the beginning of the chapter, we claim that “American history can be seen, and is often taught, as a series of arguments.” Consider the following recruitment ad from World War II. How does it, as an artifact of history, make an argument about America, and women, gender, or war?</p>	
<p>Chapter 9, “Analyzing Arguments” selected for examination because attention to the microstructure is important in hopes of developing any good awareness of the argument.</p>	
<p><b>Lesson(s) Analyzed</b></p>	<p><b>Score &amp; Justification</b></p>

<p>Activities (p. 106):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write a short analysis paragraph of the Cameron Johnson argument on page 98. Try to avoid evaluating, agreeing, or disagreeing. Instead, explain how a particular rhetorical strategy works.</li> <li>2. Read the following passage from Holly Wren Spaulding's essay, "In Defense of Darkness" (pp. 83-87). Identify the primary rhetorical moves in the passage. In other words, what is the main argument strategy here? Then, explain how that move works in Spaulding's overall argument. How does the move work to make her main claim acceptable?</li> </ol> <p>Perhaps it seems ungenerous or even paranoid to regard the physical, bright lit world in such a way. I know that it is more common to be surrounded by gazillion watts of light at night than to spend more than a few minutes in any kind of real darkness each day. In this country, most of us would have to make a considerable effort if we wanted to get anywhere that was not be in perpetual light. Why not bask in a remarkable achievement? I can imagine all manner of pushback, devils advocacy, disagreement or shoulder striking dismissal of the idea that darkness matters. Who cares? Says the voice with all of the other thing story about, speak out for, and take action against, why defend darkness? The answer is fairly straightforward: when we are strange the dark, we lose access to vital human emotions and sensual experiences including wonder and awe and humility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Read Chief Seattle's speech on the land (pp. 107-109). Decide on his main claim. What is Seattle's main assertion about the land? And what is the main line of reasoning? In other words, what individual statements (premises) build up to his main claim?</li> <li>4. After reading chief Seattle, read Andrew Buchner's analysis (pp. 110-111). Beyond the strategies Buchner identifies, what other important rhetorical strategies does Seattle use?</li> </ol> <p>Activities (p. 119):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Find an image that doesn't already have text attached to it. At a single statement that gives the image argumentative force. Share your images statement with the class and explain the relationship between the image and the statement. How do they relate? Does the image suggested claim? Or does the image function as some kind of support? Or maybe even a counter argument?</li> <li>2. Choose an online or print ad. Closely examine the images and text. What is the main claim in the ad? (It's likely related to the product or service.) How does the ad support its claim? To what common values does the ad</li> </ol>	<p>2, because of the same reasons above, except here there is even heavier emphasis on the academic/professional over the explorative.</p>
---	--

<p>appeal? What common assumptions (about identity, happiness, technology, progress, superiority, exclusion, freedom) does the ad rely on? Is there some to line of reasoning? What premises (stated or unstated) where the audience have to accept before accepting the main claim?</p> <p>3. In a small group, focus on a popular movie – one that all members has seen. Consider the following questions: in the end, who wins? Who doesn't? What does the plot invite you to dread, believe in, and hope for? What kind of person gets celebrated? What kind of person gets demonized? What behavior has consequences? What behaviors have none? How might all of these elements lead to some overall claim? What is that claim?</p>	
<b>Averaged score: 2.375</b>	



## APPENDIX SEVENTEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for *The Purposeful Argument: A Practical*

*Guide* by Harry Phillips and Patricia Bostian

Classification: Advocacy	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Your turn 1a: (p. 9):</p> <p>Make a list of issues that concern you today. Include issues in your personal life, your workplace, your school, your church, a group you belong to, your neighborhood, and your town or city. As you make your list, consider also national and global issues that affect your life, such as conflicts in other countries, environmental concerns, or fuel costs. As a way to get started with issues that are important to you, respond to the following sentences.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify a major issue in your life or a position a teacher asks you to take in response to an academic issue.</li> <li>2. When did this issue began, and why does he continue to be a problem?</li> <li>3. Identify second issue that concerns you. If in question one you identified an academic issue, identify a more personal issue here.</li> <li>4. When the issue began, and why does it continue to be a problem?</li> </ol> <p>Your turn 1b: (pp. 10, 11):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who might be interested in hearing what you have to say about the issues in your life today? Why?</li> <li>2. Is there a specific person or group that could benefit from your perspective, affecting issue, or resolve it or modify it in some way? Explain.</li> <li>3. How will you learn more about this target audience?</li> <li>4. What assumptions might it be tempting to make about this audience that may prove in accurate?</li> </ol> <p>Your turn 1c: (p. 13):</p> <p>Answer the following questions to get a sense of how local issues and have global effects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify a single glocal (sic) issue that concerns you, and describe its local effects,</li> <li>2. How do these effects have an impact on your life the lives of others?</li> <li>3. In general terms, explain how economic and political ripples from a global or national issue may spread and affect the lives of others across your region, state, and</li> </ol>	<p>3, because this is very invested in the advocacy goals in both content and tone. Further, I like the way it takes students through stages in these lessons, that it helps the student sequentially develop a response to a particular issue.</p>

community.

Your turn 1d: (p. 17):

Focus on to current issues in your life, one academic and one personal, and answer the following questions.

1. What would be your purpose in building an argument for each issue?
2. What is the claim you want to make for each issue?
3. What reasons come to mind as you reflect on each issue?
4. Can you bring to your argument personal experience with each issue? Explain.

Your turn 1e: (p. 19):

practice working with support for a claim by answering the following questions. Based on an issue you may argue on:

1. What kinds of facts can you offer?
2. How can you establish your credibility on the issue so that your audience will trust you?
3. Identify emotional connections you can create between your audience and yourself that will allow readers to identify with your issue.

Your turn 9a: (p. 220):

Answer the following questions to determine the kind of claim that is your purpose of an argument. Use table 9.1 as a guide.

1. On what single issue are you motivated to argue?
2. At what audience will you aim your argument, and why, exactly, is this audience a practical target?
3. What do you want to accomplish with this argument?

Your turn 9b: (p. 222):

Write a claim of fact in response to each of the following issues.

1. The United States accounts for more military spending than any other country.
2. You and several classmates are confused about an essay assignment.
3. Mandatory organ donation is getting more attention in your community.
4. Multinational corporations should be held responsible for poor working conditions in the farms and factories these corporations own.
5. Sentencing juveniles as adults in rages many people across your state.

Your turn 9c: (pp. 222-223):

Use the following questions to begin work with a claim of fact.

1. What kinds of logical support will you use with your claim? Specifically, what facts, data, and statistics from your research will help support your claim? What

<p>examples from real life will you bring in as part of your support?</p> <p>2. To gain credibility with your audience, you will need to draw on the work of experts and professionals. Who are these experts, and what makes them credible? Are you careful to avoid using personal beliefs in speculation as part of your logical support?</p> <p>3. What, exactly, is the context you provide your audience on your issue? What is a specific history of your issue? What are the key terms you find as you orient your audience to your issue?</p> <p>4. As part of the context you use for your audience, described the timeline, or chronology, you provide for your issue. What are the important events along your timeline?</p> <p>5. What is your audience have to gain by accepting your claim of fact?</p> <p>6. What are the strongest lines the support you will use in your argument? Will you place them early in the argument?</p> <p>7. What, precisely, are you claiming is or is not a fact?</p> <p>8. In addition to your claim, where in your argument will you use qualifiers? How will these qualifiers make your claim or believable?</p> <p>Additionally, answer the following questions to test the validity of your claim of fact.</p> <p>1. Are there clear points of view different from the claim of fact you may work with, and thus does this claim of fact respond to an issue that can be considered legitimate and arguable?</p> <p>2. Might some question whether your claim is factual?</p> <p>3. Are you prepared to prove your claim with specific information?</p> <p>If you answer yes to these questions, then your claim of fact may be interpreted as valid by audience.</p> <p>Your turn 9c: (p. 223):</p> <p>Write a problem based claim in response to each of the following issues.</p> <p>1. A growing debate across the country is whether water should be a publicly owned or privately held resource.</p> <p>2. The Department of Homeland Security, so important after the 9/11 attacks, has faded from public view.</p> <p>3. End of grade testing in public schools have some patience crying “unfair!”</p> <p>4. Advocates for the elderly argue that current Medicare allowances are in adequate for older Americans.</p> <p>5. Many subscribers to social networking sites have</p>	
--	--

<p>mixed feelings about these sites owning materials that subscribers post.</p> <p>Your turn 9e: (p. 224):</p> <p>based on the issue you working with now, answer the following questions to begin work on a problem based claim.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What specific context will you bring in to prove that the problem exists and needs attention?</li> <li>2. Is your audience in a position to act on your claim? Is it clear what you're asking your audience to do?</li> <li>3. Explain how well you know your audience and why you feel you could engage this audience with emotional examples that inspire action? What does your audience value, and what will motivate it to act on your claim?</li> <li>4. What are the compelling reasons and logical support you will use to prove that your claim is practical? Describe the research you will use to support your plan. What are your strategies to argue for the advantages of your claim and to show how it is more practical than what is in place now?</li> <li>5. How will you respond to rebuttals that assert that there is too much uncertainty about your claim because it involves a new approach to the problem?</li> </ol> <p>Your turn 9f: practice: writing claims of definition (p. 225):</p> <p>write a claim of definition in response to the use of italicize words and terms in the following statements. Remember that these popular terms have multiple meanings in our culture. Right claims that offer your definitions of the term.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does he argue for gay marriage or only being politically correct?</li> <li>2. The no Child left behind program has been as fair and equitable approach to public education in the United States.</li> <li>3. An economic bailout is the only practical way to restore confidence in our banking system.</li> <li>4. Free trade benefits everyone because it let other countries do business more easily with the United States.</li> <li>5. Campus safety is not a problem at our college and is a guarantee we make to all our students.</li> </ol>	
<p>Chapter 9, "Build Arguments," selected for analysis because it includes step-by-step instructions on crafting (building) the advocacy argument.</p>	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Your turn 9g: practice: writing claims that definition (pp. 225 - 226):</p> <p>Determine whether a claim of definition is appropriate for your purpose by answering the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the word or term you intend to define? At</li> </ol>	<p>1.75 because not only does this set of lessons lack the wonderful sequential building as those in the first chapter, it is much closer to academic/professional</p>

<p>what audience will you aim your argument?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. What context will you bring in to establish this word or term as controversial? What research will you refer to so as to establish the words different meanings, the various agendas these meetings serve, and that the word's meaning is being disputed?</li> <li>3. What populations are being affected by this words various meanings?</li> <li>4. How will you argue against popular and dictionary definitions of this word?</li> <li>5. Because your job is to replace the meanings of the word with a precise definition, explain how you will bring in and discuss clear characteristics, examples, and synonyms for the word.</li> <li>6. How will you clarify the specific conditions your definition must meet in order to be accepted by your audience?</li> <li>7. Does your definition include discussion of what the word or term is not as well as what it is? Explain.</li> </ol> <p>Your turn 9h: practice: writing claims that definition (p. 227):</p> <p>Write a claim of evaluation for each of the following issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arranged marriages, practice in some Asian and African cultures, involve a marriage arranged by people other than the two people to be married.</li> <li>2. Civil disobedience, the decision to break the law as a way to engage in political protest, has a long history in the United States.</li> <li>3. Job outsourcing, as many Americans know, can have profound effects on the local economy.</li> <li>4. A carbon tax aims to penalize those who pollute the environment with excessive carbon emissions.</li> <li>5. Reinstating the military draft is an idea that resurfaces every generation</li> </ol> <p>Your turn 9i: practice: writing claims that definition (p. 227):</p> <p>Respond to the following questions to get started on a claim of evaluation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on how you want your audience to react to your valuation, what values do share with your audience?</li> <li>2. What specific context will you bring into your argument?</li> <li>3. As your claim is grounded in a value or values you hold, are you prepared to support your claim with credible research and evidence grounded in logic and reason? Describe your research and evidence.</li> <li>4. What other standards and guidelines you use to make your evaluation? Describe how you will justify the standards based on the examples you will use.</li> </ol>	<p>than to advocacy. I give it .75 though, because it does have advocacy qualities to it, namely in that it makes direct links to how populations are affected by words (as opposed to how can we use words to affect populations?).</p>
--	--

<p>5. What rebuttals do you anticipate regarding your claim and the standards you use? How will you counter these rebuttals?</p> <p>6. We you compare you evaluation with other, similar claims, and will you contrast your evaluation with other, differing claims? In other words, how will you position yourself as part of an ongoing conversation on your issue?</p> <p>7. What emotional examples will you use to inspire and motivate your audience?</p> <p>Your turn 9j: practice: writing claims of definition (p. 228):</p> <p>With attention to the italicized words, write a claim of causing that responds to these issues in the following sentences.</p> <p>1. Grade inflation, a cause for concern among students and local employers, seems to continue from one semester to the next.</p> <p>2. Many Americans claim that restricting our civil liberties is necessary if we want to ensure national security.</p> <p>3. Stress in the workplace, a problem for everyone I know, cannot be discussed during my annual review.</p> <p>4. Children and online safety is now a national topic of debate.</p> <p>5. The issue of undocumented workers never seems to be addressed in our community.</p> <p>Your turn 9k: practice: writing claims that definition (p. 229):</p> <p>Answer the following questions to get started with a claim of cause.</p> <p>1. What, exactly, is the cause and effect relationship you are claiming?</p> <p>2. Because you argue that one event has caused other events, it is vital that you bring in adequate history for your issue. What is the history of your issue? What other specific conditions that your audience needs to know to make the connections between events that you argue for? How far back in time must you go to be convincing to your readers?</p> <p>3. What other factual examples you'll bring in to make your cause and effect connection believable?</p> <p>4. Based on your research, to others argue for causes different from yours? Describe these other claims. Why is your claim or practical?</p> <p>5. Should your audience agree with your claim of cause, how will it be beneficial?</p> <p>6. What values do you and your audience share, and what appeals we you make based on these values?</p> <p>Your turn 9l: practice: writing claims that definition (p.</p>	
--	--

231):

Complete the following sentences to determine the soundness of reasons you plan to use in an argument.

1. My claim is important because..
2. I want to use this reason in my arguments because...
3. This reason should appeal to my audience because...
4. Each reason connects directly to my claim because it...
5. I plan to delete some reasons from my argument because they...
6. Some of the information I plan to bring in to support this reason includes...

Your turn 9m: practice: writing claims that definition (pp. 234 - 235):

Explain why the following claims may not be believable to an audience. Rewrite each claim using an appropriate qualifier.

1. There must be a law that prohibits credit card companies from marketing to college students.
2. Cell phone use in the classroom is always inappropriate.
3. Homeschooling is never a substitute for a local public school with high academic standards.
4. The only way to understand the increasing high school dropout rate is to study the lack of student motivation.
5. Homelessness in our community can be solved with more affordable housing.
6. The boom in green building means that we are reducing the effects of global warming.
7. Low voter turnout in our last local election obviously means that most of us are not interested in the issues that affect our daily lives.
8. Employers have every right to monitor employee's online behavior.
9. It is now clear that success in professional sports is due to steroid use.
10. Because it is so convenient, researching online is more practical than hunting for print sources in a library.

Your turn 9n: practice: (p. 237):

Based on the issues you're working with now, determine what your audience values by answering the following questions.

1. Why is the audience invested in this issue?
2. What is the history of this audience's connection with this issue?
3. What values, principles, and beliefs motivate this audience to care about this issue?

Your turn 9o: practice (pp. 239)

<p>write a war and for each of the following examples. Build each war and based on values, beliefs, and principles the writer may share with the audience.</p> <p>1. Issue: requiring extra materials for a class Audience: your college faculty Senate Claim: teachers should not require students to purchase materials for class beyond the textbook. Support: reasons may include better requiring additional materials causes economic hardship for students and that additional materials should be made available through online sources. Specifics support may include examples of how students are inconvenienced by having to spend more on a class, such as impact on individual and family budgets. Warrant:</p> <hr/> <p>2. issue: road repair in my neighborhood audience: County commission claim: road repair in my community is based on economic status. Support: reasons may include that wealthier neighborhoods are prioritized above poorer neighborhoods and that wealthier neighborhoods have more political influence. Specifics support may include examples of long-standing problems with neighborhood roads and the quicker response time to run problems wealthier neighborhoods enjoy. Warrant:</p> <hr/> <p>3. issue: legalizing prostitution in our state audience: members of introductory ethics class claim: legalizing prostitution will reduce sex crimes in our state. Support: reasons may include that legalizing prostitution may reduce sex trap "Ryan's and our state, may reduce rape and sexual assault, and may improve public health. Specifics support can include extensive data drawn from academic studies, from state crime reports, and from healthcare professionals in the community. Warrant:</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>Averaged score: 2.375</b></p>	



## APPENDIX EIGHTEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for *Read, Reason, Write: An Argument Text*

and *Reader* by Dorothy U. Seyler

Classification: Academic/Professional (advocacy)	
Chapter 1, "Writers and their Resources," I analyze because this chapter includes sections on the basics of argument, as well as on the reading, writing, and contexts of argument.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>QUESTIONS FOR READING AND REASONING (pp. 9-10):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the conclusion of the researchers who presented their study in Science?</li> <li>2. Why are there results not telling the whole story, according Tannen? Instead of counting words, what should we study?</li> <li>3. What two kinds of talk does Tannen label? Which gender does the most of each type of talking?</li> <li>4. What is Tannen's main idea or thesis?</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTING AND WRITING (p. 10):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. How do the details – and this style – in the opening and concluding paragraphs contribute to the author's point? Answer this question. Then consider: which one of the different responses to reading does your paragraph illustrate?</li> <li>6. Do you agree with Tannen that understanding how words are used must be part of any study of men and women talking? If so, why? If not, how would you respond to her argument?</li> <li>7. "The Gettysburg address" is a valuable document for several kinds of research projects. For what kinds of research with Tannen's essay be useful? List several possibilities and be prepared to discuss your list with classmates.</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR READING AND REASONING (pp. 21-22):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is Achenbach's subject? What is his thesis? Where does he state it?</li> <li>2. What two agents together are likely to produce the next big change?</li> <li>3. Summarize the evidence Achenbach provides to support the idea that we don't recognize the next big change until it is here.</li> <li>4. If we want to try to anticipate the next big change,</li> </ol>	<p>1.5, because this is much closer to academic/professional because of attention to physical structure and audience attention (and some attention to advocacy, due to topics) then they it is to exploration. I allow .5 point though because there are explorative-type questions, such as getting students to question whether big changes are always good.</p>

<p>what should we do?</p> <p>5. What prediction did Arthur C. Clarke get right? In what way was his imagination incorrect? What can readers infer from this example?</p> <p>6. Are big changes always good? Explain.</p> <p>7. How does Achenbach identify most of his sources? He does not identify Chris Matthews or Bill O'Reilly in paragraph 1. What does this tell you about his expected audience?</p> <p>QUESTIONS FOR READING (p. 27):</p> <p>1. What marks stages in a writer's life? In what forms are these stages most enjoyed by Quindlen?</p> <p>2. What has been the prediction for the future books?</p> <p>3. Are more or fewer people reading today (2005) and in 1952? Who, today, are doing most of the reading?</p> <p>4. What two forms of snobbery can be found in the discussion about the future of books and reading?</p> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REASONING AND ANALYSIS (p. 28):</p> <p>5. In paragraph 9, Quindlen offers a definition of reading that includes a metaphor. Explain her concepts of reading in your own words.</p> <p>6. Quindlen begins by expressing her pleasure in seeing her name on the cover of a print book. What position does she except by the end of the essay?</p> <p>7. The author refers to several writers draw her essay. What does this tell you about the audience she expects? Can you identify Chekhov, Burkers, Austen, Kafka and Dickens? (Do a quick online search to identify any who are unfamiliar to you.)</p> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTING AND WRITING (p. 28):</p> <p>8. What characteristics of e-books may help to keep reading alive and well in the future? Do you agree that e-books may be the salvation of future book reading? Why or why not?</p> <p>Would you describe yourself as a reader? (How many books do you read in a year?) Do you prefer print or digital books? How would you explain your preference in a discussion with friends?</p>	
Chapter 3, "Understanding the Basics of Argument," is further inspection of argument, as seen through the eyes of academic/professional arguers.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>QUESTIONS FOR READING (p. 85):</p> <p>1. What is the occasion that led to the writing of this article?</p> <p>2. What Schobert's subject?</p> <p>3. State his claim in a way that shows that it is a</p>	<p>2, for much of the reasons given above, but a bit more credit given here because there is more of an explorative feel, in that students are asked not to "state a</p>

<p>solution to a problem.</p> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REASONING AND ANALYSIS (p. 85):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. What type of evidence (grounds) does the author provides?</li> <li>5. What are the nature and source of his backing?</li> <li>6. What makes his opening effective?</li> <li>7. What values does Schobert express? What assumption does he make about his readers?</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTING AND WRITING (p. 85):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Are you surprised by any of the facts about elephants presented by Schobert? Do they make sense to you, upon reflection?</li> <li>9. Should zoos close down their elephant houses? Why or why not?</li> <li>10. Are there any alternatives to city zoos with small elephant houses besides elephant sanctuaries?</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR READING (p. 88):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is Reid's claim?</li> <li>2. Explain the term "pre-gaming."</li> <li>3. What do college administrators say is their position on underage drinking on campus? What do they say actually happens on their campuses?</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REASONING AND ANALYSIS (p. 88):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Analyze Reid's argument using Toulmin's terms. What passages contain his evidence (grounds)? Does he qualify as claim? (Study his word choice throughout.)</li> <li>5. Evaluate Reid's argument. What kind of evidence does he use? Is a convincing? With what audience(s) might his argument be most successful?</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTING AND WRITING (p. 88):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Do you agree with Reid? If so, is that because you want to drink legally or because you think he has a convincing argument?</li> <li>7. If you disagree, what are your counterarguments? Organize a rebuttal for class debate or an essay.</li> </ol> <p>QUESTIONS FOR READING (p. 90):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is Califano's initial purpose in writing?</li> <li>2. How do American teens compare with European teens in terms of alcohol consumption, binge drinking, and intoxication?</li> <li>3. What are the consequences of teen drinking?</li> </ol>	<p>claim and defend" but by asking students to open up thinking (e.g., # 8 on p. 85 "Are you surprised" is an excellent way to get students to "address counterargument" without telling them it's counterargument).</p>
--	--

<p>4. What are some of the causes of teen drinking?</p> <p>5. How do American adults and teens feel about this country's drinking age?</p> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REASONING AND ANALYSIS (p. 90):</p> <p>6. Analyze Califano's argument using Toulmin's terms.</p> <p>7. Analyze the authors organization. What does he do first? Second? And so on? How does his organization help his rebuttal?</p> <p>8. Evaluating Califano's argument. What kind of evidence (grounds) does he use? Is it effective?</p> <p>QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTING AND WRITING (p. 90):</p> <p>1. Do you agree with Califano? If so, then presumably you accept the legal drinking age of 21 – right? If you disagree with Califano, what are your counterarguments?</p> <p>Usually, what kind of argument works best with you, one based on personal experience and anecdotal or one based on statistics? Why?</p>	
<b>Averaged score: 2</b>	

## APPENDIX NINETEEN

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for *They Say/I Say* by Gerald Graff, Cathy

Birkenstein, and Russel Durst

Classification: Academic/Professional (advocacy)	
Chapter 4, “Yes/No/Okay, But” chosen for analysis because the focus is on student responses, getting students to actively engage in the writing process.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Exercises (p. 67):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Read one of the essays in the reading section of this book, identifying those places where the author agrees with others, disagree, or both.</li> <li>2. Write an essay responding in some way to the essay that you worked with in the preceding exercise. You want to summarize and or quote some of the author's ideas and make clear whether you're agreeing, disagreeing, or both agreeing and disagreeing with what he or she says or he remember that these are templates in this book that can help you get started; see chapters 1 through three for templates that will help you represent other people's ideas, and chapter 4 for templates that will be in stores on.</li> </ol>	1.5 because I think it's a good brainstorming activity, but overall it does not have the rigorous attention to developing form that a good academic/professional lesson should have.
Chapter 8, “As A Result,” selected for analysis because the focus on connecting the parts of an argument should give good insight into what the authors think arguments should look like.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Exercises (pp. 119-120):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Read the following opening to Chapter 2 of <i>The Road to Wigan Pier</i> by George Orwell. Annotate the connecting device is by underlining the transitions, circling the key terms, and putting boxes around the pointing terms.</li> </ol> <p>Our civilisation... Is founded on coal, more completely than one realises until one stops to think about it. The machines they keep us alive, and the machines that make the machines, are all directly or indirectly dependent upon coal. In the metabolism of the Western world the coal miner is second in importance only to the man who plows the soil. He is sort of a grimy carrots and upon whose shoulders nearly everything that is not grimy is supported. For this reason the actual process by which coal is extracted is well worth watching, if you get the chance and are willing to take the trouble.</p>	1.25 because while it does help students understand the parts of arguments, its more focused on transitions rather than arguments, and the students do not have opportunity to do their own writing of arguments.

When you go down a coal mine it is important to try and get to the coal face when the “fillers” are at work. This is not easy, because when the mine is working visitors are a nuisance and not encouraged, but if you go at any other time, it is possible to come away with the totally wrong impression. On a Sunday, for instance, a mind seems almost peaceful. The time to go there is when the machines are roaring and the air is black with coal dust, and when you can actually see what the miners have to do. At these times the places like Hal, or at any rate like my own mental picture of hell. Most of the things one imagines in hell are there – heat, noise, confusion, darkness, foul air, and, above all, unbearably cramped space. Everything except the fire, for there is no fire down there except the feeble beams of Davy lamps and electric torches which scarcely penetrate the clouds of cold dust.

When you have finally got there – and getting there is a job in itself: I will explain that in a moment – you crawl through the last line of pit props and see opposite you a shiny black wall three or 4 feet high. This is the coal face. Overhead is a smooth ceiling made by the rock from which the call has been cut; underneath is the rock again, so that the gallery you are in is only as high as the ledge of coal is soft, probably not much more than a yard. The first impression of all, over mastering everything else for a while, is the frightful, deafening din from the conveyor belt which carries the coal away. You cannot see very far, because the fog of cold trusts throws back the beam of your lamp, you could see on either side of you the line of half naked kneeling men, one to every four or 5 yards, driving their shovels under the fallen call and cleaning is with Lee over their left shoulders....

Read over something you've written with a knife for the devices you've used to connect the parts. Underline all the transitions, pointing terms, key terms, and repetition. Do you see any patterns? Do you rely on certain devices more than others? Are there any passages that are hard to follow – and if so, can you make them easier to read by trying any of the other devices discussed in this chapter?

**Averaged score: 1.375**

## APPENDIX TWENTY

Phase Two: Select-Chapter Lesson-Plan Analysis for *The Well-Crafted Argument The Well-*

*Crafted Argument* by Fred D. White and Simone J. Billings

Classification: Academic/Professional (advocacy)	
Chapter 1, "The Nature and Process of Argument," selected for analysis because it should talk about what argument <i>is</i> according to the authors.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Writing Projects (pp. 46, 47):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conduct an informal survey of students that he habits by talking to your fellow students. How many of them cram for exams or write their papers immediately before the assignment is due? What specific strategies do students use when they study? (For example do they make marginal glosses in their books? Write notes on index cards? Make flashcards? Get together with other students in regular study groups?) Can you correlate methods are habits of study two levels of academic success or should Mark write an essay in which you argue for or against such correlation, using the responses you have gathered.</li> <li>2. Write an essay on the role that argumentative writing can play in helping people would disagree about a given issue to arrive at better understanding – or least and a greater willingness to cooperate. What likely obstacles must initially be overcome?</li> <li>3. Keep a "writing process log" the next time you write an argument. Describe in detail everything you're doing pretty writing, composing each draft, revising, and proofreading. Next, evaluate the log. Which facets of the composing process were most helpful? which were least useful?</li> <li>4. Compose for possible openings, each a different type (occasional, anecdotal, startling, analytical), for your next argument writing assignment. Which openings is most appropriate for your essay, and why?</li> <li>5. Prepare an outline (Classical, Toulmin, or Rogerian) for an essay taking a position on one of the following topics: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All places of business should (should not) block the Facebook site to keep employees on task.</li> <li>b. This college should (should not) sponsor formal skateboarding competitions.</li> <li>c. More courses or programs in ethnic or gender studies need (do not need) to be offered at this college.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>2.75, because there is a lot of attention to the physical structure of the argument (e.g., "compose possible openings) but also pays attention to the physical development of the student (e.g., writing process log, informal survey).</p>
Chapter 3, "Methods of Critical Reading," selected for analysis because through examining how the textbook's authors describe how to critically read arguments should give more insight	

into what they think arguments should look like.	
Lesson(s) Analyzed	Score & Justification
<p>Writing Projects (p. 119):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write a critical response to one of the following quotations about reading. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "To write down one's impressions of Hamlet as one reads that year after year would be virtually to record one's own ought by UBL graffiti, for as we know more of life, Shakespeare comments on what we know." (Virginia Woolf)</li> <li>b. "We read often with as much talent as we write." (Ralph Waldo Emerson)</li> <li>c. "The greatest part of a writer's time is spent in reading." (Samuel Johnson, as quoted by James Boswell)</li> <li>d. "To read well... is a noble exercise... It requires a training such as the athletes underwent, the study intention almost of the whole life to this object." (Henry David Thoreau)</li> <li>e. "A reasoning passion." (How the French novelist Collett described her experience of reading Victor Hugo's <i>Les Misérables</i>.)</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Write an essay in which you propose ways of improving one's reading strategies. You may want to discuss the strategies in relation to particular types are reading materials. How well do young people in elementary grades read today, compared to their counterparts 20 years ago? 50 years ago? Prepare an investigative study, making use of a lease to visual aids (charts, graphs, tables) to illustrate your findings.</li> </ol>	<p>2, because the focus is not as clearly on the academic/professional (more on advocacy, I would say), nor on the development of the student, except for in Exercise 2.</p>
<b>Averaged score: 2.375</b>	



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, Matthew. Developing Activist Rhetorics on Israel-Palestine: Resisting the Depoliticization of the American Academy. In *Activism and Rhetoric: Theories and Context for Political Engagement*. (eds. Seth Kahn and JongHwa Lee). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. New York. 2011. Print.
- Reframing Identifications: Recognizing the Effects of the Past in the Present within Debates about the Israel-Palestine Conflict in *Re/Framing Identifications* (ed. Michelle Ballif). Long Grove IL: Waveland Press. 2014 (pp. 133 – 41). Print.
- Aikin, Scott F. Perelmanian Universal Audience and the Epistemic Aspirations of Argument. in *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. Vol. 41, No. 3 (2008) (pp. 238-259). Stable URL: [http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/philosophy\\_and\\_rhetoric/v041/41.3.aikin.pdf](http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/philosophy_and_rhetoric/v041/41.3.aikin.pdf). Accessed: April 24, 2014.
- Alford, Barry. 2002. Freirian Voices, Student Choices. *Pedagogy* 2(1): 109-118. Stable URL: [https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Alford,+Barry.+2002.+Freirean+Voices,+Student+Choices.+Pedagogy+2\(1\):+109-118.&spell=1](https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=Alford,+Barry.+2002.+Freirean+Voices,+Student+Choices.+Pedagogy+2(1):+109-118.&spell=1). Accessed December 13, 2013.
- Andriessen, J. Teaching and Learning Argumentative Reading and Writing: A Review of Research. In *Reading Research Quarterly*: 46(3) July/August/September 2011. (273-304). Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41228654>. Accessed: February 12, 2012.
- Argumentation. Oxford English Dictionary. Stable URL: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/10668?redirectedFromargumentation>. Accessed: March 3 2014.
- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. San Bernardino, CA: RedaClassic.com. 2010. Print.
- Artz, Lee. Speaking Truth to Power. In *Activism and Rhetoric: Theories and Context for Political Engagement*. (eds. Seth Kahn and JongHwa Lee). Routledge Taylor &

- Francis Group. New York. 2011. Print.
- Baker, George Pierce and Henry Barrett Huntington. *The Principles of Argumentation*. Oxford UK: Ginn and Company. 1895, 1905. Print.
- Barnet, Sylvan and Hugo Bedau. *Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing: A Brief Guide to Argument*. Boston, MA: Bedford / St. Martins. 2014. Print.
- . *From Critical Thinking to Argument: A Portable Guide*.  
Boston, MA: Bedford / St. Martins. 2014. Print.
- Bate, Walter Jackson. *Negative Capability*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA: 1939. Print.
- Bateman, Geoffrey W. Ethical Encounters at the intersection of Education and Activism. in *Re/Framing Identifications* (ed. Michelle Ballif). Long Grove IL: Waveland Press. 2014. Print.  
Print. (pp. 61-67).
- Bawarshi, Anis. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition*. Logan, Utah: Utah State UP. 2003. Print.
- Bazerman, Charles. The Work of a Middle-Class Activist Stuck in History. In *Activism and Rhetoric: Theories and Context for Political Engagement*. eds. Seth Kahn and JongHwa Lee (eds). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. 2011. Print.
- Belenky, M.F., B.M. Clinchy, N.R. Goldberger and J.M. Tarule. *Women's Ways of Knowing*. New York: Basic Books. 1986. Print.
- Bentahar, Jamal, Bernard Moulin, Micheline Belanger. A taxonomy of argumentation models used for knowledge representation. Stable URL  
<http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10462-010-9154-1.pdf>. Accessed: January 14 2013.
- Berthoff, Ann E. Learning the Uses of Chaos. in *The Norton Book of Composition Studies* (ed. Susan Miller). New York: W.W. Norton & Co. 1979. Print.

- Besnard, Philippe and Anthony Hunter. *Elements of Argumentation.*, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press. 2008. Print.
- Billig, Michael. *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology.* Cambridge, MA: University Press. 1996. Print.
- Binyon, Lawrence. Argument", Canto XXVIII. In Paolo Milano.\ *The portable Dante.* (Rev. ed.). 1978. Harmondsworth: Penguin. Print.
- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Boston MA: Bedford/St. Martin's. 2001. Print.
- Blair, Hugh. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Library. 2009. Print.
- Bolduc, Michelle K. and David A. Frank. Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca's "On Temporality as a Characteristic of Argumentation": Commentary and Translation *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 43(4). 2010. pp. 308-336. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5323/philrhet.43.4.0308>. Accessed: June 14, 2014.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of RHETORIC: The Quest for Effective Communication.* United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2004. Print.
- Branham, Robert James. *Debate and Critical Analysis: The Harmony of Conflict.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1991. Print.
- Braet, Antoine. The Classical Doctrine of 'Status' and the Rhetorical Theory of Argumentation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* , 20(2). 1987. Stable URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/40237501.pdf?acceptTC=true>.
- Buckley, Michael J. Philosophic Method in Cicero. In *Journal of the History of Philosophy.* 8(2). From: Journal of the History of Philosophy . Volume 8, Number 2, April 1970 . (pp. 143-154.) Stable url: 10.1353/hph.2008.1752. Accessed: April 2 2014.
- Butler, H.E. Quintilian II Books IV-VI. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA. 1921, 1953, 1960, 1966. Print.

- Carroll, Jeffrey. Essence, Stasis, and Dialectic: Ways That Key Terms Can Mean. In *Rhetoric Review*, 23(2). 2004. pp. 156-170 Stable URL: <http://0-www.jstor.org.helin.uri.edu/stable/20176610>. Accessed: February 7, 2014.
- Carter, Michael. Stasis and kairos: Principles of social construction in classical rhetoric. *Rhetoric Review* 7(1). 1988. Stable URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/07350198809388842>. Accessed: June 17, 2014.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Inventione*. (trans. H.M. Hubbell.) Trans. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA. 1949. Print.
- . *Topica*. (ed. trns. Tobias Reinhardt.) Oxford University Press. Oxford, NY. 2003. Print.
- Clark, Irene L. A Genre Approach to Writing Assignments. *Composition Forum* 14(2). 2005. Stable URL <http://compositionforum.com/issue/14.2/clark-genre-writing.php>.
- *College Argument: Understanding the Genre*. Dubuque IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company. 2010. Print.
- Cohen, Patricia. Reason Seen More as Weapon Than Path to Truth. Published: June 14, 2011 in *The New York Times*. Print.
- Cornificius (Attributed to). *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Trans. James J. Murphy, Richard A. Katula, Forbes I. Hill, Donovan J. Ochs.
- Cox, J. Robert and Arthur Willard (eds). *Advances in Argumentation Theory and Research*. Carbondale IL: Southern Illinois University Press. 1982. Print.
- Crable, Richard E. *Argumentation as Communication: Reasoning with Receivers*. Columbus OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company. 1976. Print.
- Crusius, Timothy W. and Carolyn E. Channell. *The Aims of Argument: A Text and Reader*. New York, NY: 2011. Print.
- Cushman, Ellen. Gadugi: Where the Fire Burns. In *Activism and Rhetoric: Theories and Context for Political Engagement*. (eds. Seth Kahn and JongHwa Lee). Routledge

- Taylor & Francis Group. New York. 2011. Print.
- Dissoi Logoi in *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. 2001. Print.
- Droge, David and Bren Ortega Murphy, eds. *Voices of Strong Democracy: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Communication Studies*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. 1999. Print.
- Dugan, John. Cicero's rhetorical theory. In *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*. Catherine Steel ed. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press. 2013. Print.
- Eisenberg, Abne M. and Joseph A. Ilardo. *Argument: An Alternative to Violence*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1972. Print.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne and Marie Secor. Grounds for argument: Stasis theory and the topoi. Ed. D. Zarefsky. *Argument in transition: Proceedings of the Third summer Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association. 1983. Print.
- . The Stases in Scientific and Literary Argument. *Written Communication* 5(4). 1988. Stable URL <http://wex.sagepub.com/content/5/4/427.full.pdf+html>.
- Faigley, Lester and Jack Selzer. *A Little Argument*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc. 2013. Print.
- Faules, Don F. and Richard D. Rieke. *Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking*. Scranton PA: International Textbooks Company. 1968. Print.
- Fitts, Karen and Alan W. France Advocacy and Resistance in the Writing Class: Working toward Stasis. In *Pedagogy in the Age of Politics* Eds. Patricia A. Sullivan and Donna J. Qualley. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. 1994. 13-24. Print.
- Freeley, Austin J. and David L. Steinberg. *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. Boston MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. 2009. Print.
- Frow, John. *Genre: The New Critical Idiom*. New York: Routledge. 2010. Print.
- Gooch, John and Dorothy Seyler. *Argument*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. 2013. Print.

- Goshgarian, Gary and Kathleen Krueger. *Dialogues: An Argument Rhetoric and Reader*. New York, NY: Longman. 2007. Print.
- Govier, Trudy. *A Practical Study of Argument*. Independence, KY: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. 2014. Print.
- Graff, Gerald, Cathy Birkenstein, and Rulssel Durst. *They Say / I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Co. 2012. Print.
- Gwynn, Aubrey. *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian*. New York: Teachers College Press. 1926. Print.
- Heinrichs, Jay. *Thank You for Arguing*. New York: Three Rivers Press. 2007. Print.
- Herrick, James A. *Argumentation: Understanding and Shaping Arguments*. State College PA: Strata Publishing, Inc. 2011. Print.
- Holtmark, Erling B. Quintilian on Status: A Progymnasma in *Hermes*, 96. Bd., H. 3 (1968), Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag. 356-368. Article Stable URL: <http://0-www.jstor.org.helin.uri.edu/stable/4475522>. Accessed: May 5, 2013.
- Horne, Herman Harrell. *The Democratic Philosophy of Education*. The Macmillan Company. New York: 1933. Print.
- Joliff, David A. The Myth of the Transcendence. In *Pedagogy in the Age of Politics* Eds. Patricia A. Sullivan and Donna J. Qualley. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. 1994. 183-94. Print.
- Keith, William and David Beard. Toulmin's Rhetorical Logic: What's the Warrant for Warrants? *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 41(1). 2008. Stable URL [http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/philosophy\\_and\\_rhetoric/v041/41.1keith.pdf](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/philosophy_and_rhetoric/v041/41.1keith.pdf). Accessed: February 2, 2014.
- Kennedy, G. *The art of rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton University Press. Princeton NJ. 1972. Print.

Ketcham, Victor Alvin. *The Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*. New York: The MacMillan Company. 1914. Print.

Kienpointner, Manfred. "On the Art of Finding Arguments: What Ancient and Modern Masters of Invention Have to Tell Us About the 'Ars Inveniendi'." in *Argumentation*. May 1977 11(2). Stable URL:  
<http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023%2FA%3A1007738732374.pdf>.  
Accessed: September 19, 2013.

Knoblauch, A. Abby. A Textbook Argument: Definitions of Argument in Leading Composition Textbooks. *College Composition and Communication* 63(2). 2011.  
Stable URL:  
[http://sluenglish.pbworks.com/w/file/etch/49204262/A%20Textbook%20Argument.p](http://sluenglish.pbworks.com/w/file/etch/49204262/A%20Textbook%20Argument.pdf)  
df. Accessed: March 1, 2013.

Kock, Christian. Generalizing stasis theory for everyday use. In *Bending Opinion: Essays on persuasion in the public domain*. Amsterdam: Leiden University Press. 2011. Print.

Krolokke Charlotte, Ann Scott Sorensen. *Gender Communication Theories and Analyses: From Silence to Performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc. 2006.  
Print.

Kruger, Arthur N. *Counterpoint: Debates about Debate*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 1968. Print.

Lamb, Catherine E. Beyond Argument in Feminist Composition. *College Composition and Communication* 42(1). 1991. Stable URL  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/357535.pdf?acceptTC=true>. Accessed: July 1, 2013.

Leff, Michael C. The Topics of Argumentative Invention in Latin Rhetorical Theory from Cicero to Boethius. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1983), pp. 23-44

- Article Stable URL: <http://0-www.jstor.org/helin.uri.edu/stable/10.1525/rh.1983.1.1.23>. Accessed: August 15, 2013.
- Liu, Yameng. Rhetoric and Reflexivity. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. 1997, Vol. 30(4). 333-349. Stable URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/40237869.pdf>. Accessed: December 23, 2013.
- . Aristotle and the Stasis Theory: A Reexamination. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* Vol. 21, No. 1, Winter, 1991. Stable URL [www.jstor.org/stable/3885280](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3885280). Accessed May 17, 2013.
- Logic. Oxford English Dictionary. Stable URL: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/109788?p=emailAyGMXEbb5jgTE&d=109788>. Accessed: March 3, 2014.
- Lunsford, Andrea A., Kurt H. Wilson, Rosa A. Eberly, Eds. Sage Publications, Inc: *The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*. 2009. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea A. John J. Ruskiewicz, Keith Walters. *Everything's an Argument*. Boston MA: Bedford St. Martin. 2013. Print.
- MacNealy, Mary Sue. *Strategies for Empirical Research in Writing*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon. 1999. Print.
- Mauk, John and John Metz. *Inventing Arguments*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. 2013. Print.
- McBath, James H. (ed.) *Argumentation and Debate: Principles and Practices*. Austin TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1954, 1963. Print.
- McKeon, Richard. Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. In *Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies*. XVII(1). January, 1942. (pp. 1-32).
- Miller, Carolyn R. Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70. 1984. Stable URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00335638409383686>. Accessed:



January 3, 2012.

Murphy, James J., Richard A. Katula, Forbes I. Hill, Donovan J. Ochs. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric* Third Edition. Mahwah NC: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 2003. Print.

Naess, Arne. *Argumentation: Approaches to Theory Formation*. (Barth, M.E. and J.L. Martens eds). John Benjamins B.V. Amsterdam: 1982. Print.

Newell, George E., Richard Beach, Jamie Smith, Jennifer VanDerHeide, Deanna Kuhn and Jerry Andriessen. Teaching and Learning Argumentative Reading and Writing: A Review of Research. In *Reading Research Quarterly*: 46(3). Stable URL <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1598/RRQ.46.3.4/abstract>. Accessed: October 15, 2013.

Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Trans. Jon Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame. 1969. Print.

Perelman, Chaim. How Do We Apply Reason to Values? *The Journal of Philosophy* 52(26)(Dec. 22, 1955), pp. 797-802 . Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2022489>. Accessed: May 17, 2013.

Phillips, Harry and Patricia Bostian. *The Purposeful Argument: A Practical Guide*. Boston MA Wadsworth Cengage Learning. 2012. Print.

Ramage, John, Micheal Callaway, Jennifer Clary-Lemon, and Zachary Waggoner. *Argument in Composition*. West Lafayette IN: Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse. 2009. Print.

Rechnitz, Andrew Nicholas. Democracy as Discursive Insurgency: Entering and Breaking. in *Re/Framing Identifications* (ed. Michelle Ballif). Long Grove IL: Waveland Press. 2014. Print.

Rehg, William. *Cogent Science in Context: The Science Wars, Argumentation Theory, and*

- Habermas. The MIT Press. Cambridge, MA: 2009. Print.
- Rottenberg, Annette T. and Donna Haisty Winchell. *Elements of Argument: A text and reader*. Boston: Bedford St. Martin. 2012. Print.
- Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Deliberate Conflict: Argument, Political Theory, and Composition Classes*. Carbondale IL: Southern Illinois University Press. 2004. Print.
- Seyler, Dorothy U. *Read, Reason, Write: An Argument Text and Reader*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies. 2012. Print.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton, Eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malen MA: Blackwell Publishing. 2005. Print.
- Stasis. Oxford English Dictionary. accessed online 3 March 2014. Stable URL: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/189229?p=emailAyH7r4c2IIqB6&d=189229>. October 31, 2012.
- Thomas, Joseph. In *Facebook* [response to post]. Retrieved via Facebook post. from <http://www.facebook.com/#!/wendy.grosskopf.3>. Accessed: October 29, 2012.
- Tindale, Christopher W. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA. 2004. Print.
- Toulmin, Stephen E. *The Uses of Argument*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2008. Print.
- Wander, Philip C. Forward. In *Activism and Rhetoric: Theories and Context for Political Engagement*. (eds. Seth Kahn and JongHwa Lee (eds). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. New York NY. 2011. Print.
- Walton, Douglas. *One-Sided Arguments: A Dialectical Analysis of Bias*. Albany: State University of New York Press 1999. Print.
- Walton, Douglas and Erik Krabbe. *Types of Dialogue and Burdens of Truth*.
- White, Fred D. and Simone J. Billings. *The Well-Crafted Argument: A Guide and Reader*. Boston MA: 2014. Print.

Williams, David Cratis and Michael David Hazen. *Argumentation Theory and the Rhetoric of Assent*. Tuscaloosa AL: The University of Alabama Press. 1990. Print.

Willard, Charles Arthur. *Argumentation and the Social Grounds of Knowledge*. Tuscaloosa AL: The University of Alabama Press. 1983. Print.